

# THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

---

NO. 2.—APRIL, 1896.

---

## I.

### THE FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR OF 1870-71.

BY RICHARD C. SCHIEDT.

THE battle of Waterloo had annihilated the gigantic forces of the great Napoleon; his throne, constructed upon the fortifications of the Reign of Terror and cemented with blood, had suddenly collapsed for the second time and forever, and the once omnipotent war lord had to pass the end of his days in utter silence upon the solitary rock of St. Helena. After twenty-five years of bloodshed and the prevalence of atrocious horrors, Europe once more settled down to enjoy the comforts of peace, re-establishing the pre-Napoleonic boundaries of the various continental countries as far as possible. The Holy Roman Empire of the German nation had gone to pieces under the forceful blows of Bonaparte's hammering, and its place was taken by the miserable state compound of the German confederacy, headed by two great powers, Austria and Prussia, with the former constantly on the watch for an opportunity to humiliate its rival, who had so nobly fought for the liberation of Germany. In this scarcely laudable effort Austria was seconded by the many other smaller states and statelets whose representatives had gathered around the

green table of the Frankfort Assembly. Frederick William III. was not the man to offer a decided resistance. He had together with Austria and Russia established the Holy Alliance for the protection of the *status quo* and, above all, of the rights of kings. The German university students and professors, who had dreamed of and fought for the reawakening of a strong and free German Empire, now filled the state prisons, and the Holy Alliance weighed like a heavy burden upon the shoulders of worn-out Europe.

A purifying thunderstorm was needed in order to clear the sultry political atmosphere of the times. Wherever the Vienna Congress had wrought mischief, *i. e.*, in France, Italy, the Netherlands, in Poland, even in Germany, demands for greater freedom began to be heard. The famous Parisian July Revolution of 1830 overthrew the senile reign of the Bourbons forever, and the young House of Orleans ascended the French throne; Belgium separated from Holland as an independent kingdom; a number of minor states in Middle and North Germany demanded and were granted constitutions; the liberal governments of Italy, on the other hand, were crushed beneath the iron heels of the Austrian armies, just as the sudden rebellion of the Poles yielded to the gigantic power of the Russian Empire. Again, the threatening rod of Austria enforced a graveyard peace in Germany; the idea that Prussia should be the kingdom of the future, the center for a united Germany, lived hardly anywhere but in the worried brains of a few politicians, and only the Tariff-Union, slowly developing under Prussia's lead, could be considered a feeble preparation for a coming awakening. When in 1840 King Frederick William III. died, following his great statesmen and generals, who had dragged him against his will in 1813 to the front of the intense struggle for liberty, and his son, Frederick William IV. ascended the Prussian throne, everybody expected a golden age for Prussia and Germany. The young king had indeed many good intentions, but little energy; much intellect, but little courage; many beautiful words, but no will power; and thus discontent with the miserable conditions of German affairs rapidly

increased. The smouldering fire burst into a blaze when in February, 1848, a new revolution was inaugurated in Paris and the House of Orleans was wiped away as ingloriously as 18 years before was that of the Bourbons. Now everywhere a powerful popular uprising rushed, as it were, against the worn-out conditions created by the 30 years' reign of the Holy Alliance. In Vienna and Berlin and Munich, yea, in all the smaller German towns, the people were enthusiastically invited to participate directly in the government of their respective states; for the first time in the history of their existence a reconstruction of the entire German constitution was demanded. The Frankfort league was powerless against this mighty onslaught of the people. In all the German states representatives of the liberal party displaced the men of the old regime in the various cabinets; and without much difficulty the first German Parliament assembled in May of '48, in St. Paul's Church in Frankfort-on-the-Main, for the purpose of constructing a new constitution for a united Germany. King Frederick William IV. granted without a word of objection the demands presented by the people and suppressed the riots of the mob in the streets of Berlin; however, only for a short time, for the only manly defender of the Prussian arms, Prince William, was sent into exile to England. Finally, after the Prussian National Assembly had exhausted all the madness of its revolutionary experiments, Frederick William IV. gave his people a national parliamentary constitution and thus ended the internal wars. A similar cyclone with similar results passed over Austria, but the difficulties of the Frankfort Parliament were not yet removed. Austria, with the following of Hungarians, Lombardians, Slavs, Poles, etc., could no longer remain the chief ruler over German affairs, while Prussia's good intentions, but feeble actions, were despised in South Germany; so was its king, a brilliant, amiable, eloquent weakling. However, the idea of a German Empire with a German Parliament could not be abandoned. It had become immortal; the crown of the new constitution was the establishment of a hereditary imperial monarchy, a monarchy that should and could only be in the possession of the most

powerful of the purely German princes, *i. e.*, of the King of Prussia, although he then was of but little account. This plan was, as a matter of course, bitterly opposed by the representatives of Austria and the democratic leaders of the Southern German states; nevertheless, by a small majority, Frederick William IV. was elected hereditary German Emperor. However, the Prussian king, convinced of his own weakness, fearing the enmity of Austria and some of the middle states, but especially abhorring the all-wise university men of the Frankfort Parliament, declined the honor, and the dream of a glorious resurrection of a new German Empire ended in a sad and melancholy awakening. Despair again seized upon the best minds of the land; the clearest thinkers, the noblest patriots, returned home broken-hearted from the disbanded Parliament of Frankfort. The time was not yet at hand; the man who should transform the paper crown of Frankfort into one of gold on the field of battle had not yet been called upon the arena of history; his turn came twenty years later. All efforts of Frederick William IV. to win the other German states north and south for his plans failed; he even had to submit to violent interferences on the part of Austria, within his own domain in Hesse and Holstein, in spite of the respectable strength of the Prussian army, finally yielding, in the treaty of Olmütz of 1850, to the most outrageous demands ever made upon a prince of the House of Hohenzollern. Electoral Hesse was again delivered into the hands of its wretched prince, Holstein under the united rule of Austria and Denmark, and the pitiable Frankfort League was re-established. The only redeeming feature in the whole transaction was the commission of Otto von Bismarck-Schönhausen to represent Prussia in the Frankfort League. And again the peace and silence of the church-yard reigned supreme in German lands during the fifth decade of the 19th century. In the meantime stirring events had taken place in neighboring countries. After the expulsion of the House of Orleans, France had again established a Republic with Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, the nephew of the great Napoleon, as President. The new ruler had spent the years of his childhood in



Germany, his young manhood in Switzerland. Firmly convinced of his mission to re-establish at some future day the French Empire, he had made several unsuccessful attempts to overthrow the throne of King Louis Philippe, a folly which brought him the pleasure of spending several years of imprisonment in some French fortress, until he succeeded in escaping to England. Sly as a fox, he entered, largely through the influence of his name, in September, 1848, the National Assembly, being, at the end of the year, elected President of the Republic for four years. Born a conspirator and educated to intrigue, he nullified, by an act of violence, the new constitution, on the 2nd of December, 1851, and closed the National Assembly; yet the French people, tired of rebellions and longing for peace, extended by a general vote, Napoleon's Presidency to ten years, offering him on the 2nd of December, 1852, the title and rights of Emperor. Being unsuccessful in his efforts of obtaining a wife from among the old royal families, he married, at the beginning of 1853, the beautiful Eugenie de Montijo, duchess of Spanish Teba. Their only child was born in March, 1856, receiving the name Prince Napoleon Eugene Louis.

Napoleon III. had promised before his *coup d'etat* that the Empire would mean peace. Nothing was more untrue. His whole aspiration was concentrated upon the one aim to become the supreme arbiter in European affairs, and the road to such honors leads through blood. Russia alone had passed through the stormy Revolutionary period without a single tremor; Emperor Nicholas, aided by his formidable army, supported Austria in its severe struggle against Hungary, opposing Prussia's policy with an iron hand and hindering it in all its movements by his constant threats. The omnipotent Czar felt that his time had come for a renewed attack upon feeble Turkey. The surprise and annihilation of the Turkish fleet in the Black Sea on the 13th of November, 1853, caused, in the spring of 1854, the formation of the Franco-English alliance, joined later by little Sardinia, for the protection of Turkey; Austria changed its friendly relation toward Russia, while Prussia remained neutral.

In the fall of 1854 the united fleets of France, England and Turkey enclosed the strong fortress, Sebastopol, forcing it to surrender after a year's severe fighting. Emperor Nicholas died from chagrin, and his successor, Alexander II. negotiated for peace in March, 1856.

This so-called *Peace of Paris* changed European affairs completely. Russia's omnipotence was irretrievably broken, her influence in Europe gone. Napoleon III. had accomplished his purpose; his regiments and his guns had decided Sebastopol's fall and the star of his fame and power had reached the zenith. Prussia had lost its rank as a great power, and little Sardinia took its place by virtue of her bold policy.

However, Prussia's time of action was not far distant. King Frederick William IV. nicknamed to this day by the jovial Berlinians "Champagner Fritz," lost his mind, and gradually his office and work passed into the hands of his brother, Prince William of Prussia, who since 1858 acted as independent prince regent, and on the 2nd of January, 1861, after the death of his brother, he was crowned King of Prussia. It was high time that a strong monarch should again occupy the Hohenzollern throne. Napoleon III. had in 1859 joined Victor Emmanuel of Sardinia, for the purpose of liberating Italy from the supremacy of Austria. After repeated defeats the latter called upon Prussia for assistance, but King William would only consent on the condition that he be made commander-in-chief of the united forces, a demand that seemed so humiliating that Austria quickly asked for peace, which was negotiated on the 11th of July, 1859, at Villafranca, involving the loss of Lombardy and enlarging the chasm between the two great German powers.

King William I. was already 64 years of age when he ascended the throne of his fathers, but a man of sound conscientious principles, clear, deliberate and vigorous in his thinking, free from all the fantastic notions of his brother, conscious of his aims and determined to preserve with all the firmness of his courage whatever he had gained. Despising the humdrum policy of the high church party of the court, he concentrated his studies chiefly

upon military questions. His clear vision well recognized that the time of the great struggle had not yet passed, that sooner or later accounts had to be settled with Austria and France, and, in order to avoid a second Olmütz, Prussia had to reorganize and to strengthen its war forces. With the help of a liberal ministry and a yielding house of representatives, the necessary pecuniary means were obtained for the gigantic task to be undertaken. Members of the Prussian staff had carefully studied the tactics in the Crimea, in Italy, in North America and in Mexico, under the leadership of General von Moltke, the former adviser of the Turkish Pasha on the Euphrates and Tigris, now appointed and inspired by his great king himself. Profiting by his own experience in the Baden campaign of 1848, and on the basis of the most important military reports of other campaigns, William I. ordered that all military tactics, from the target drill and marching exercises of single companies to the greater movements of whole armies, should be carried out on war principles. Service and life in the open camp became more and more prominent, creating a change which astonished, during the manœuvres of 1862 and '63 on the Rhine, in Brandenburg, all foreign representatives. The victory of the French, especially of Napoleon I. had depended upon the presence of the great warrior himself; wherever his generals were left to their own initiative they were invariably defeated. William I. on the other hand, directed his whole energy toward the preparation of good generals and officers. Men like Moltke, Roon, Manteuffel, Hindersin, Peuker, etc., owe their fame largely to his discovery of their talents and ability. After the death of Napoleon his tactics had largely passed to oblivion in France, while they were introduced and taught by the talented Clausewitz in Prussia. Clausewitz became the revealer of the secret of Napoleon's military skill, so that it may be said that the battles which William the Victorious fought were fought with Napoleon's weapons. They were, however, not a mere copy; William's keen, strategic insight recognized at once the new momenta which railroads and telegraphs had produced in military science, and only with their

aid those great triumphs could be obtained which the world has witnessed. Also, in organizing the line of battle, William I. excelled the Frenchman, or, rather, his schooling excelled the latter's genius. Napoleon massed his armies before the battle began. In most cases the masses gathered right in front of the enemy's army, and only after the massing had taken place the real battle opened, showing that success depended entirely upon his personal presence, for whenever he left a single position in others' charge it became endangered. The great national armies of William I. on the other hand, were subdivided into independent under armies, acting according to general directions, given with classic brevity in from 3 to 6 lines. They followed separate lines of marching, but made united charges. Herein lies another great strength of the German army. Battles like those of Königgrätz, Woerth, Gravelotte, Beaumont, Sedan, Orleans and Le Mans, where the different armies always united just at the beginning of the battle, will remain typical as indicative of the generalship of William I. Further, the use of the railroad and telegraph system, so thoroughly studied by Moltke, enabled the leaders to give orders and make announcements with a precision never heard of before. A long and thorough preparation during times of peace was the watchword of old William, for when war is announced we must know at once, by the quickest calculation of space, time, ground and strength, whither to dispatch armies along railroad lines. However, the best intentions of the king were not always appreciated by his people. When, in the spring of 1862, the clouds of war seemed to have dispersed, the House of Representatives refused to furnish further means towards the completion of the army organization, and the king needed a stalwart man, true to his king and his country, to stand by him in the great battles fought on the rostrum in the Parliament of the people. This man appeared in the person of Otto von Bismarck-Schönhausen. He was a Prussian dyed in the wool; having been invincible upon the student's fighting ground in the university, passing through 27 bloody encounters without a scratch, he entered the arena of public life in 1848 as the king's man, with the firm determina-

tion to stand by Prussia and the House of Hohenzollern with all the energy of his mighty personality, and to fight for Prussia's supremacy over all the German states with the same surety of success which had always characterized him in his contests with men. As representative of Prussia in the Frankfort League of 1857 he had learned to know and to despise the haughtiness of Austria and its intrigues with the small German states, recognizing the necessity of a future war between his country and Austria. He therefore advocated, as the head of the Prussian ministry in 1862, the granting of further means for the completion of the reorganization of the army, uttering the now famous words: "Not by speeches and majority resolutions are the great questions of an age decided—that was the error in '48 and '49—but by blood and iron." But it was only after the severest contests and by compromise that Bismarck obtained the much-coveted millions; and only after Denmark's opposition in Schleswig-Holstein necessitated the united action of both Austria and Prussia in 1864. Duke Frederick of Augustenburg, however, refused after the liberation of the Elb duchies, to accept Prussia's supervision, and demanded the participation of Austria—a fatal request, which led to a complete separation of the two great powers and finally to the decision on the field of battle. Bismarck endeavored to win the smaller North German states over to Prussia, but failed, and now Moltke's work began. The great triumphal march of the newly organized armies of King William through Southern Germany and Austria, the brilliant results on the bloody field of Königgratz in 1866, and the conditions of the Peace of Prague are too well-known to need repetition. The German League of Frankfort was dissolved, Schleswig-Holstein became the sole property of Prussia, and the Southern states had to swear allegiance to the victors. Thus Prussia had become what the best German minds had wished her to be, chief among the purely German states.

Napoleon III. had watched Prussia's rapid progress with a heavy heart; he had to remain a mere spectator since his foolish expedition into Mexico had greatly decimated his army and his



treasury. However, already during the preliminary peace negotiations at Nicholsburg, preceding the Peace of Prague, he had sent the French Ambassador, Count Benedetti, to Bismarck, demanding compensation for the increase of Prussia's power, *i. e.*, desiring the transmission of one of the Rhine provinces, Rhenish Hesse, the Bavarian Palatinate and the cities of Mayence, Saarlouis and Saarbrücken; in case of a refusal he threatened Prussia with war. But Bismarck's decided answer and his own inability to enter upon further war preparations forced the French Emperor to accept the refusal and to think of other means by which to humiliate Prussia. He therefore made offers to the King of Holland for the purpose of purchasing the Grandduchy of Luxemburg, which since 1866 had been separated from the German league. But Prussia, whose soldiers occupied the fortress of Luxemburg, for the protection of the Rhenish provinces, objected to such a project, and the London treaty of 1867 decided that Napoleon should withdraw his offers and Prussia her soldiers. Another humiliation to Napoleon, he grimly explained: "Bismarck has fooled me, an Emperor of the French dare not allow himself to be fooled!" And forthwith he began to increase and improve his armies. A new army rifle, the chassépot was introduced, the mitrailleuse or gatling gun added to the war implements, horses were purchased, geographical maps of Germany (not of France) distributed among the officers, and Austria was approached for the purpose of a future alliance against Prussia. Napoleon had strong hopes that Southern Germany would not assist Prussia in case of war, that the confiscated Kingdom of Hanover would rebel, and that Italy, which was under obligation to him, as well as Austria and Denmark, would certainly stand by him; besides the French army was, as a matter of course, equal to any emergency. It only remained to find a plausible cause for war, which would not involve Germany as such, but Prussia alone. Bismarck had quietly but very attentively followed Napoleon's movements upon the European chess-board; he had made no claims upon France, had politely declined all offers of an alliance made by France for the sake of increasing

her territory, but had been especially careful that the Prussian army should be prepared at a moment's call to arms. Moltke, with the sure expectation of coming events, had in 1868 traveled incognito through France and its German frontier territory, accompanied by his daughter, who made the most accurate detailed draughts of important military positions, of every turnpike and every creek, thus enabling her father to work out his campaign plans with rare accuracy. Such was the situation in the summer of 1870.

Napoleon's friend and ally, the virtuous Queen Isabella of Spain, had been in the fall of 1868, after a most miserable failure of her policy, dethroned and driven out of the country. The Spaniards offered their crown to Portuguese and Italian princes, but they refused to accept so dangerous a gift, and the Duke of Montpensier, Isabella's brother-in-law, was deterred from accepting it by Napoleon's objection. Among those who as early as 1869 had refused the crown was Prince Leopold von Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, the son of the former liberal Cabinet President of King William. The Hohenzollerns are descendants of an old family of noble counts whose ancestral castle is situated in the Swabian Alps, somewhere along the upper Danube. The older branch remained in the ancestral seats and acquired the title of imperial electoral princes. In 1806 they belonged to the Rhinebund and became, by marriage with a Princess Murat, related to the Bonapartes. In 1849 the two Princes of Hechingen and Sigmaringen ceded their land to the Prussian crown. The younger branch obtained in 1200 the title of Burggrafen of Nuremberg; later they came into possession of the now Bavarian districts of Ausbach and Bayreuth and received in 1415 the margravy of Brandenburg as a fief. Thus the Swabian and Prussian Hohenzollern claims a relationship of nearly a thousand years' standing. However, the members of the older branch remained Catholic, while the younger accepted the Reformation; the King of Prussia has always been looked upon as the head of the entire house of Hohenzollern, with merely advisory power. Prince Leopold was married to a Portuguese

princess, and to him, in June, 1870, the request came for the fourth time to become King of Spain. The French government never presented any objections at Madrid, which would have been the simplest means of eradicating the whole plan. Prince Leopold, therefore, accepted the offer, and on the 3d of July, 1870, Europe was made acquainted with the fact. King William, when asked for the consent, as the head of the family, replied that he had no objections to offer to any such choice of the prince.

Profound peace prevailed throughout Europe. King William enjoyed the quiet of the beautiful summer resort of Ems; Bismarck had returned to his Pomeranian estate at Varzin; Moltke spent his vacation at his cherished country seat at Kreisau. All at once, like lightning from a clear sky, the news spread throughout Europe that France had threatened Prussia with war. On the 4th of July the Duc de Gramont, Minister of Foreign Affairs, asked at Berlin for an explanation of Prince Leopold's action; the reply stated that the whole affair had no relation whatever to the Prussian government. On the 6th of July, at a sitting of the French Chambers, the Minister declared that they could under no condition tolerate that a foreign power should place one of its princes upon the throne of Charles V. and thus disturb the political equilibrium of Europe, touching the interests and honor of France; France would do its duty without hesitation and weakness! M. Ernest Picard, formerly French Minister of the Interior, says in an article on the subject, published in *Littell's Living Age*, of August, '92: "The impression of every one versed in diplomatic usage was that the Minister had spoken too freely in dwelling on the wisdom of Prussia and the friendship of Spain. This language touched the patriotic chord, but it was marked by an arrogance that was not calculated to promote negotiation; the minister had sought, above all things, to flatter the national self-esteem and to turn to account the effervescence of public opinion. M. Ernest Picard asked that the document matter should be laid on the table. The Minister of the Interior refused in the name of the Duc de Gramont. At last M. Emile

Olivier, President of the Council, had to intervene to obtain an adjournment." M. Picard continues (I quote him in order to be perfectly impartial in the matter): "Our ambassador, Count Benedetti, armed with instructions from the Duc de Gramont, saw the King of Prussia at Ems on July 9th. The king replied that while he had put no pressure on Prince Leopold to accept the overtures of the Spanish Cabinet, he was determined not to forbid him. He acted not as a sovereign, but as head of the family. He left Prince Leopold freedom of action, and if, in face of the agitation produced in Spain, the candidature was withdrawn, he would approve the decision instead of resisting it, but he would do nothing more, and refused as steadfastly to advise withdrawal as to enforce it." This language in reality amounted to a declaration of inactivity at once unacceptable and hurtful to our dignity. At this time the representative of the Spanish government at Paris, M. Olizaga, sent M. de Stratt on a mission to Prince Antoine of Hohenzollern, father of Prince Leopold, in order to urge him to persuade his son to decline the Spanish throne. M. de Stratt succeeded, and our minister came out of the negotiations with honor. Such was the feeling of Emperor Napoleon on the morning of July 12, when he left M. Clouet and went to the Tuileries to preside over the Council of Ministers. At the Council the renunciation was accepted by the majority of the Ministers, and the Duc de Gramont calculated on announcing it to the chamber at the next day's sitting. However, through some irresponsible persons, the news got into the daily papers, and sarcasm was bestowed with no niggard hand on the Minister, who contented himself with a renunciation from Father Antoine." The Minister tried to stem the tide of opinion by having the following notice inserted in *The Constitutionnel*, the official journal.

"The Hohenzollern prince will not reign over Spain. We ask no more, and we hail with pride the peaceful solution. A great victory which has cost no tear, no drop of blood." But the vast majority of the press repeated that peace would be essentially illusive, shameful, sinister, ridiculous, especially the press of the great centers of population, while complete calm reigned in the

country districts. Napoleon was forced to call a new Council at St. Cloud in the evening of July 12th, in which it was decided that the Comte Benedetti, our Ambassador at Berlin, should ask the King of Prussia to undertake once for all to forbid Prince Leopold to accept the candidature for the throne of Spain. The Duc de Gramont's telegram sent during the night ran: "Say explicitly that we have no ulterior motive, that we do not seek a pretext for war, and that we only seek an honorable road out of a difficulty which is not of our own making." However the king refused to listen to any further parleying on this subject, and finally intimated to Comte Benedetti, by the Minister in attendance, that his Majesty had nothing further to communicate to the Ambassador. The good offices tendered by the Queen of England in the interest of a peaceful solution were immediately crushed by Count Bismarck, and when the legislative body met, on July 13th, our Minister of Foreign Affairs saw that war was unavoidable, and in a sitting of the Council, on the 15th of July, he solemnly announced "that the reserves were called out and a proposition for granting the necessary funds for the carrying on of war was now in order." So for the account of M. Picard. I shall take the liberty of calling another and entirely impartial witness upon the stand. In 1892 an extremely interesting book made its appearance in England under the unassuming title "An Englishman in Paris," written by an intimate English friend of Napoleon III. a frequent visitor to Compiègne and bienvenu in all the ramifications of imperialistic and official circles and courtiers. This book throws a flood of light on the inner life of the French capital during the greater part of Louis Philippe and the whole of the period from his abdication to the end of the Commune, in May, 1871. Perhaps the most prominent figure of his second volume, which concerns itself with the period of the Empire is the Empress. Nobody could have better opportunities of judging of the character of Eugenie, and of the nature and weight of her influence on affairs, social and national alike. It is clear that the author considers the Empress to have exercised the most important individual impression on the des-



tinies of the Second Empire, being directly responsible for its collapse. He describes her marriage to Napoleon, her tyrannical intolerance, her overweening ambition and equally overweening conceit, most impartially, yet most forcibly. As the Parisians held her, whom they contemptuously called the "Spanish Woman," responsible for the failure of the Mexican war, so she seems to have been responsible for the outbreak of the war of 1870-71. In contrast with the statements made above he expresses his convictions that war was decided upon between the imperial couple so early as between the 5th and 6th of the month, and narrates in proof thereof that, early in the afternoon of the 5th of July, Lord Lyons, driving into the courtyard of the British Embassy, beckoned him in and told him that in spite of the animosity of the Duc de Gramont towards Bismarck, who had once laughed him to scorn in a diplomatic transaction, the Emperor would insist upon peace, if only the Empress would leave him alone. Napoleon was fast approaching his death and wished anything but war. However, on the morning of the 6th of July, a third Council of the Ministers was held for the purpose of framing an answer to M. Cockery's interpellation regarding the Hohenzollern candidature. The same afternoon the author of the book met Joseph Ferrari, the intimate of Emile Olivier's brothers, and so a likely man to have exclusive information. "It is all over," said Ferrari, "and unless a miracle happens, we'll have war in a fortnight." "But," remarked the author, "about this time I was positively assured, and on the best authority, that the Emperor was absolutely opposed to anything but a pacific remonstrance." "Your information was perfectly correct," replied Ferrari, "and as late as ten o'clock last night, at the termination of the second Council of Ministers, his sentiment underwent no change. Immediately after that the Empress had a conversation with the Emperor, which I know for certain, lasted till one o'clock in the morning. The result of this conversation is the answer, the text of which you will see directly, and which is tantamount to a challenge to Prussia. Mark my words, the Empress will not cease from troubling until she has driven France

into a war with the only great Protestant power on the continent. It is the Empress who will prove the ruin of France!" The speech which the Duc de Gramont made in the chamber on that very day, as quoted above, only too accurately, proves how well Ferrari was informed. On the 15th of July the Senate unanimously voted 50,000,000 francs to the war budget, which was afterwards confirmed by the legislative body by a majority vote of 245 to 10; among the latter was old Thiers, who called the war a folly.

Already on the evening of the same day the multitudes filled the streets of Paris with cries of: "Down with Prussia!" "Long live the war!" "To Berlin! To Berlin!" On the 19th of July the declaration of war was presented at Berlin, the only written document of the whole question.

All the German people from the North Sea to the Alps, from the Rhine to the Weichsel endorsed the action and conduct of King William and Bismarck in the whole transaction, feeling that his personal affair had touched the national honor. The Southern German states at once joined Prussia, led by Bavaria, whose king issued his call to arms in spite of the Catholic opposition, as early as the 16th of July, only 24 hours after the bill had passed in Paris; Baden and Württemberg followed immediately. In opening the North German Reichstag on the 19th of July, King William said: "If Germany tolerated such violations of her rights and her honor in past centuries she did so because, in her distraction, she did not know how strong she was. To-day, when the inner bond of a rightful unity begun in the Wars of Liberation from Napoleon's tyranny unites the German nations with increasing harmony; to-day, when Germany's preparation no longer offers a breach to the enemy, Germany possesses within herself the determination and the strength to refute renewed French violations. We shall fight after the example of our forefathers for our liberty and for our right against the violence of foreign usurpers, and in this struggle, in which we seek nothing but the enduring peace for Europe, God will be with us, as He was with our fathers." Parliament voted unanimously 120 million

thalers for the war, Crown Prince Frederick William, the idol of the people, the pupil of Moltke, was appointed commander-in-chief of the Southern army; Prussians, Bavarians, Würtembergians and Saxons marched side by side, filled with the same enthusiasm, in the bloody conflict. Moltke's plan was to mass his troops in the Palatinate in order to prevent the French from invading South Germany, to put off operations against the French capital to the very last, to draw the hostile armies away from the rich South and to force them into the narrow territory of the North, and especially to attack immediately and always with large numbers. He carried out his plan most accurately, aided by the blindness of his opponents.

With the hasty declaration of war the Germans expected a rapid aggressive advance of the French along the Rhine, but they did not seem to be in a very great hurry, so that the various German armies had time enough to take their respective positions undisturbedly; the first army corps of 60,000 men under General Von Steinmetz occupied the right wing in Southern Rhenish Prussia in the direction of Saarbrücken; it was followed by the second army of 194,000 strong under the command of Prince Frederick Charles occupying the center of the Bavarian Palatinate along the southern passes of the Hartz mountains; the third army 130,000 strong, commanded by the Crown Prince of Prussia and comprising two Prussian and two Bavarian corps, together with the forces of Würtemberg and Baden, constituted the left wing, stationed in the neighborhood of the city of Landau. The three armies formed a west-eastern column from Saarbrücken to Landau, with a front of 12 miles and numbering 384,000 men, numerically far superior to the French forces.

The French plan supposed that the German army would expect the first attack from behind the strongly fortified Rhine region; the French were to cross the Rhine below Strassburg and thus separate the Southern from the Northern German army. In order to carry out such a plan the French commander ought to have massed all his forces near Strassburg; instead of that, however, Napoleon distributed his men over eight widely separated posi-

tions. Near the German frontier in a west-easterly direction opposite Saarbrücken General Frossard was stationed; near Bitsch General Failly; near Strassburg the most famous general of the Empire, MacMahon, with an advance guard near Weissenburg; far away from the scene of action, and without any opponent along the Swiss frontier, near Belfort, General Felix Douay had massed his forces. Still further in the interior the Imperial Guards were stationed; General Bourbaki near Nancy, Marshall Bazaine near Metz, General Ladmirault near Diedenhofen along the Moselle, and still further back in the fortifications of Châlons Marshall Canrobert. Furthermore the various regiments had proceeded to their various positions, without waiting for the reserved forces, the ending of which created a terrible disorder, especially since in many cases the most necessary equipments were wanting. Thus the much lauded Army of the Rhine consisted of 300,000 men, or 80,000 less than the German, distributed over eight widely separate places.

France did not succeed in gaining allies. Bismarck had secured the neutrality of Russia; Austria feared Russia if it should join France, and Denmark was checked by the three German army corps stationed along the northern coast and the decided victories of the Germans right in the beginning; only Italy was willing to invade Bavaria, provided the French would cede the temporal possessions of the papal power, but Eugenia could not acquiesce to such a compromise, and the war had to be fought out as an honest duel between Germany and France.

In the meantime the excitement in Paris had reached the high-water mark; everywhere the question was heard: Is our army not yet on its way to Berlin? Something had to be done. Therefore, Emperor Napoleon, accompanied by his 14-year-old son, left his capital on the 28th of July, in order to take charge of his forces, transferring the responsibilities of the government to the Empress during his absence. On the 2d of August three French divisions, under Frossard, marched against the Prussian frontier city of Saarbrücken, occupied by a few companies of Hohenzollern infantry and Rhenish Uhlans under Lieutenant-

Colonel von Pestel. They wisely withdrew, allowing the enemy to triumphantly enter the city and to occupy it for at least one afternoon, for towards evening the French troops retreated upon the Spichern heights, happy to have once at least stepped upon German soil as victors; henceforth they should only do so as prisoners. This insignificant encounter lasted for about three hours. Emperor Napoleon was present with his son Louis, but returned to Metz after sending the following dispatch to the Empress: "Louis has received his baptism of fire. He was remarkably cool and undismayed. The Prussians offered but little resistance; Louis and I were where the bullets fell thickest. Louis picked one up and put it in his pocket, and the soldiers wept over his coolness. We lost an officer and ten men. Napoleon."

The joy over this victory was unbounded in Paris. However, the French commander-in-chief was in absolute ignorance of the movements and strength of his opponents and was therefore at a loss what to do; a greater concentration of the scattered forces seemed necessary; for that purpose MacMahon was summoned to Metz to participate in a council of war. In the meantime King William, Bismarck, Moltke and Roon had arrived on the scene of action; the left wing of the great army, under the command of the Crown Prince of Prussia, crossed the frontier and attacked the fortified city of Weissenburg. The French soldiers were just preparing their scanty breakfast when the first Bavarian cannon ball disturbed the arrangement of their coffee pots. The surprise was complete, since not even a single outpost had been stationed along the lines, and with an enthusiastic hurrah the 4th Bavarian division advanced against the fortress, followed by the 5th and 11th Prussian corps and the 3d Bavarian division, directing their onslaught against the strongly fortified Gaisberg, occupied by the African Turcos. About half past one o'clock Weissenburg fell, after a most terrible encounter, into the hands of the Bavarians, while the Prussians became masters of the Gaisberg, the king's own grenadiers headed by Major von Kaisenberg, taking, under a veritable rain of bullets, the castle crowning



the hill, after the loss of at least a-half dozen of their leaders. General Douay, the French commander-in-chief, was killed, and the remnant of his decimated forces fled southward. 1,500 Germans were numbered among the dead. The crown prince likewise turned southward, but was met by the Feld-Marshal MacMahon at the head of a large army, stationed near Woerth and extending to the villages of Elsasshausen and Froschweiler. The fight, commenced by the outposts, gradually changed into a bloody battle on the 6th of August, in which the entire third Prussian army was involved. Orders were given to the 5th corps under Kirchbach to advance against the enemy's center at Froschweiler, and to the Bavarians and Württembergians to attack the right and left respectively. These orders were carried out with great precision. General von Blumenthal, chief of the great staff, watch in hand, pointed to the minute when the rise of smoke should indicate that his orders had been carried out. But the hand had not reached the number when the thunder of the cannons verified his expectations. The chief aim of the Germans was to occupy Woerth, cross the small stream beyond and take the neighboring hills, covered with orchards, vineyards and hop plantations, by storm. In the meantime MacMahon played billiards in the mansion of headquarters; he won the game, but lost the battle. The German onslaught was irresistible, first Woerth, then Elsasshausen, were taken by storm. In vain did the heroic French cuirassiers charge, across underbrush, ditches, hedges, the Prussian infantry. The horrible whizzing of many thousands of bullets drowned the gallant cry of "Vive la France!" and the few returning horsemen rushed into the sabres of Prussian hussars. At last Froschweiler turns into a mass of burning débris. MacMahon orders a last attack of his gallant cuirassiers, to be led by one of his personal friends. "It is sure death, general," his friend replied. "It is true," was MacMahon's answer, "but what can we do! Embrace me, dear friend!" and in a few minutes men and horses were swept from the ground without ever having seen the faces of their enemies. MacMahon covered his face and wept; he, the Prince of Malakoff, the Duke of Ma-

genta, the most famous general of the Empire, was thoroughly beaten, his army put to flight, one part seeking refuge behind the walls at Strassburg; another and larger one rapidly fleeing westward. Ten thousand lay on the field of battle either dead or wounded; 6,000 were prisoners, one eagle, 4 standards, 28 cannons and 5 gattling guns were taken; 500 German officers, and 10,000 of the men were numbered among the dead and the wounded; but victory was theirs and the dying soldiers exclaimed, "We are dying for the Fatherland; we are proud of our victorious army!" and when the 30 or more music bands began to play "Die Wacht am Rhein," many thousand voices accompanied the inspiring tune, all finally joining in fervent prayer and thanksgiving to Him who had given them the victory.

The division, consisting of Baden troops, received orders to march south and to besiege Strassburg, the commander of which, General Uhrich, a German by birth, refused to surrender. Thus from the 9th of August till the 27th of September the beautiful city was bombarded and stood the terrors of a siege. Crown Prince Frederick William marched through the defenseless passes of the Vosges mountains and entered Nancy on the 16th of August. At the same time the second, or chief army under Prince Frederick Charles, moved likewise southward, but found no enemy. Only its right wing, in touch with the first army under Steinmetz, arrived at noon of the same 6th of August at the river Saar. Frossard had fortified himself, after withdrawing from Saarbrücken, upon the steep heights of Spichern, which seemed invincible. The Prussians had not intended to begin a battle and did therefore not arrive *en masse*. But regiment after regiment was sent up the steep mountain side until after heavy losses they succeeded in forcing the enemy to recede, the victors losing 4,800, the defeated 4,000 men. In each case, at Weissenburg, at Woerth and at Spichern, the Germans were the aggressors, the French choosing the defensive. The news of these defeats created general consternation and wrath at Paris. The easy-going Olivier was the first victim of this wrath, followed by Lebœuf, Minister of War, and Gramont, the great talker. Count Mon-

tauban-Palikao, who had won doubtful laurels in China, became Minister of War. Napoleon did not dare to return to Paris under the circumstances, but stayed with his son in Metz, whither the scattered French army took its flight. When King William entered the enemies' territory he issued a proclamation to the French people, in which he declared that he urged war with the soldiers, not with the citizens, promising personal protection to all who remained peaceable. On the 12th of August Napoleon transferred the chief command of the armies to Marshall Bazaine, who had gained his reputation in Mexico. His intention was to leave the invincible fortress of Metz in charge of a barely sufficient garrison force and to march with the five army corps concentrated at Metz, westward through Verdun to the strongly fortified camp of Châlons sur Marne in order to unite here with MacMahon's forces, and thus to accumulate an army of 300,000 men, ready to prevent the Germans from reaching Paris. The plan might have succeeded if the French army had been quicker in its movements, but on the 14th Prince Frederick Charles drove them back to Metz. In the battle of Colomby alone the Germans lost 5,000 men, 1,400 more than the French. West of Metz, about 3,000 yards apart, there are the three villages of Mars la Tour, Vionville and Rezonville. Here all the French corps were stationed, ready to march off. To prevent this at any cost was the great problem of the German leaders. The third corps of the Brandenburgians under Alvensleben furiously attacked the much larger but unconcerned and unsuspecting forces of the enemy, and for twelve hours this most terrible and most memorable of all the battles was waged with alternate success. The villages of Mars la Tour and Vionville were taken by storm and retained, but the resistance could not last long, since Canrobert gave orders that all his overwhelmingly larger forces should enter the battle. Longingly the brave Brandenburgians look out for assistance. There, all at once the trumpets are heard and the earth trembles with the sound of quickly approaching horses like the rushing of a mighty wind, they are coming, the cavalry brigade of Baden, the Magdeburg cuirassiers under Count

Schmettan and the regiment of Brandenburgian Uhlans under Major von Dollen. The orders are to clear the way through the woods, and shouting the old battle cry: "With God for king and country!" with sabres drawn and lances in position, men and horses rush upon the enemy. "Ein Blutritt war's ein Todesritt." After riding down two lines of battle orders are given to retreat, but only one trumpeter can be found, and as he puts the trumpet to his mouth a shrill, wailing, complaining sound is heard; the instrument, too, was pierced by bullets. Out of six regiments only two returned, but the point was gained; the enemy had to retire behind the wall of the fortress. The same bravery distinguished the dragoon guards at Mars la Tour; the much-longed-for reinforcements had finally arrived and the left wing of the Germans was re-established. Once more the cavalry is ordered to an attack, this time Westphalian cuirassiers, Hanover Uhlans, dragoons and Magdeburg hussars began their attack against the whole right wing of the French. As late as a quarter of seven the most celebrated and bloody cavalry fight of the whole campaign begins; through the great clouds of dust the German battle cry, "Hurrah! Hurrah!" is heard. We witness a terrible clashing of arms, a surging to and fro, a mass of glittering lances and swords, and finally the wild flight of the enemy. The German cavalry had gained the day. Bazaine had to retreat towards Metz, but the loss on either side amounted to more than 1,600 men.

It is hard to understand why Bazaine whose road to Châlons was by no means enclosed, did not at once collect his remaining forces of cavalry, infantry and artillery for a last dash towards liberty, especially since the Germans were well-nigh exhausted. Moltke, whose book on the war I follow as the best authority, says that only political reasons could have induced Bazaine to stay at Metz. Instead he offered two days afterwards, on the 18th, a new battle, west of Metz, called the battle of *St. Privat-Gravelotte*, the position of the French corps of Canrobert, of Ladmirault, of Lebœuf and of Frossard seemed formidable and inaccessible; fortified behind a parallel series of hills French

infantry and artillery, almost invisible to the enemy, poured forth volleys of the deadly lead with telling effect, for not a single tree was seen far and wide along the plains and hills which the aggressive Germans had to traverse. King William was present in person close to the line of battle. Moltke himself led the second army corps, late towards evening, triumphantly against the forces of Frossard, which, almost sure of victory, had changed from the defensive to the offensive, determined to reconquer Gravelotte. But Moltke and darkness forced them to a hasty retreat. The battle of St. Privat-Gravelotte decided the three days' fight of two great nations in favor of the Germans. On either side about 180,000 men had taken part in the engagement, the French occupying by far the best positions, which their opponents had to take by storm and without any shelter in almost every case. No wonder that the Germans lost 20,000 men, while the French only counted 13,000. To-day the whole region between St. Privat and Gravelotte is one continuous graveyard. Think of three formidable battles within five days! The problem before the victors was now to enclose Metz, with its 173,000 French soldiers and its formidable forts placed in a circumference of thirty miles around Metz, in such a way as to make escape impossible; ordinary military measures were here of no avail; only want of food would compel surrender. Prince Frederick Charles with a part of the second army, numbering 150,000, undertook the task, while Crown Prince Albert of Saxony became the head of a newly formed fourth army, which, together with the third, commanded by the Crown Prince of Prussia, was to move westward in order to attack the last and only free French army under MacMahon. King William accompanied both as commander-in-chief.

After his defeat at Woerth, Marshall MacMahon had retreated to the fortified camp near Châlons, where all the scattered French forces collected, numbering finally four army corps and two cavalry divisions. With him was Napoleon, who had left Metz before the great battles began; his condition was pitiable in the extreme; his authority counted for nothing, since the Empress reigned in Paris, and Bazaine and MacMahon were the



chiefs of the army. He did not dare to show himself before his soldiers, for they only mocked him, while his return to Paris meant revolution. MacMahon had intended to concentrate his forces around Paris, from where he could most advantageously carry on his operations, but the Empress and the Minister of War, Count Palikao, insisted that he should endeavor to unite with Bazaine. Unwillingly he dispatched his troops via Rheims northward to Rethel, in order to cross the Meuse in quick marches and to move southeastward toward Verdun for the purpose of uniting with Bazaine. The plan was extremely bold; it carried the last of the armies close to the Belgian frontier; in case of a lost battle the army would either have to surrender or to enter Belgian territory. The success of the plan depended upon MacMahon's timely crossing of the Meuse as well as upon Bazaine's escape from Metz; either was impossible. In the meantime the third and fourth German armies proceeded westward towards Châlons, always headed by a division of cavalry wrapped in an immense cloud of dust; the camps at Châlons was empty, and King William established his headquarters somewhat south of the city of Châlons at Bar le Duc, where news was received by way of London that MacMahon's army stood at Rheims, waiting orders to march eastward towards Metz. Moltke remarks in his book, in reference to these informations: "It is always a serious matter to change a well wrought-out plan for a new, unprepared one, unless extreme necessity demands it. Rumors and unreliable information can never justify the changes of a march route. In a war we only reckon with probabilities, and it is always most probable that the enemy will choose the right measure. From that point of view I could not expect that MacMahon would expose Paris and march along the Belgian frontier toward Metz. Such an undertaking seemed strange, even adventurous, but it was possible." Moltke rightly judged the French when he believed the adventurous to be probable. He at once gave orders that the two armies should move northward towards Sedan in order to prevent MacMahon from crossing the river Meuse. With ape-like celerity, though marching

through the pathless forest of the Argonnes and constantly fighting against the omnipresent *Franc-tireurs* the work was accomplished. On the 30th of August the advance guard of MacMahon under general De Failly was surprised; measures of precaution were never the strength of the French, and they were completely routed. The French chief found it necessary to retreat within the walls of Sedan; his soldiers, known for their courage and bravery, were worn out and discouraged; long fruitless marches and poor provisions, together with the succession of unfortunate encounters, had broken their physical and moral strength. This army took its position to the north, east and south of Sedan, protected in the rear by the river Meuse and the old, but poorly situated fortress; towards the east and north the two valleys of the Givonne and Floing brooks offer the strongest fortification, but the attack was to come from the west.

Early in the morning of the 1st of September the world-famous battle of Sedan began. Protected by the morning fog, the Bavarians, under General von der Tann, crossed upon two pontoon bridges the Meuse, and attacked at Bazeilles the right wing of the French army, while the Saxons took La Manœonne further to the north. Here MacMahon was severely wounded by the bursting of a bombshell, and General Ducrot took his place. At the same time General de Wimpffen arrived from Algiers in obedience to the orders of the Minister of War, which conveyed to him the appointment of commander-in-chief. He considered a retreat utterly impossible, but was of the opinion that, by massing all the forces against the Bavarians and Saxons, a union with Bazaine might yet be accomplished. The proposition of General de Wimpffen was accepted and carried out, but there appeared all at once in the upper Givonne valley the Prussian guards, who had marched all night in order to complete the iron ring that encircled MacMahon's forces. All the villages of the Givonne valley were in the hands of the Germans, and upon the heights above and behind them their batteries began their music of thunder and lightning, accompanied by volleys of deadly shot striking into the very midst of the hostile army. Now the

break for Metz was no longer possible, likewise a retreat to Mezieres. The army of the Crown Prince of Prussia had started during the night to cross the Meuse shortly below Sedan and now appeared north of the fortress near Floing and Illy; all heights were occupied by artillery, and at noon the French army was completely encircled. In vain the brave cavalry of General Gallipr tried to break through the Northern German line; his furious onslaught was met by the rapid firing of German infantry; at short distance the whole field was covered with wounded and dead horsemen. Finally only the woods of Givonne were left as the only place of comparative safety, but it did not last long against the furious cannonade of the German artillery. The French soldiers gradually gave up all hopes of ever gaining a single position; by the hundreds they allowed themselves to be taken prisoners, or they rushed into the little town of Sedan, where they expected a place of safety, but no sooner had they reached the streets of the place when the bombshells began to play upon the unfortunate city; the columns of fire began to rise towards heaven, and at about half-past five the white flags were seen upon the towers of the city, indicating the willingness to surrender.

King William had, surrounded by his suit, witnessed the battle from a neighboring elevation. Bathed in sunshine lay Sedan below, but the beauty of nature was marred by the wretched work of man; the king witnessed the gallant attack of Gallipr and his heroic death at the head of his riders, witnessed how the German batteries closed nearer and around Sedan, how the dissolved and confused regiments streamed into the town, how Sedan and its villages became a mass of fire, and yet no sign of a capitulation. It was then that he sent Lieutenant-Colonel von Bronsart with the white flag into the city to ask its surrender. Napoleon himself received him and led him to General Wimpffen, a German by birth. At about 7 o'clock General Reille presented a letter from Napoleon to King William, which read as follows: "Sir Brother: Since I could not find death at the head of my troops I place my sword into the hands of your majesty.

I am your majesty's well-wishing brother. Napoleon." The king replied, after a short consultation with the Crown Prince, Bismarck, Moltke, Roon, etc.: "Sir Brother: Regretting the circumstances under which we meet, I accept your majesty's sword and beseech you to appoint one of your officers with power to act in matters touching the surrender of the army which so bravely fought under your command. I have appointed General von Moltke for this purpose. I am your majesty's well-wishing brother. William." After much parleying on the part of the French and a personal interview between Napoleon and Bismarck, whom shortly before the former had called a man not to be taken serious, the conditions of surrender were finally agreed upon and signed. 1. The French army of Sedan, numbering 104,000 men, with one marshal, 50 generals and 2,800 officers, become prisoners. 2. All generals and officers are to go free upon giving their word of honor in writing henceforth not to operate against Germany. 3. All arms, standards, eagles, cannons, ammunition, etc., are to be transferred to a German commission. 4. The fortress of Sedan is placed under the command of King William. 5. The officers and men not included under the two are disarmed and taken to Germany. Wimpffen received permission to return to his relatives in Würtemberg. Such a surrender the world had never witnessed before, and the celebration of this victory in Germany was worthy the occasion. Napoleon was sent to the castle of *Wilhelmshöhe*, near Cassel, where he had time to reflect upon the vanity of this world's greatness. His son had been sent over Belgium to England shortly after his father had left Metz. Not many days after the fall of Sedan, France was again declared a Republic, governed by a committee of twelve, among whom the lawyer Gambetta and Jules Favre were the most prominent. Empress Eugenia fled from Paris in the carriage of her American dentist, Dr. Evans, from Lancaster county, who brought her safely to Belgium, whence she proceeded to England to meet her son, and where she still resides, a heart-broken widow, for Napoleon died already on the 9th of January 1873, and his son Louis was killed in 1879, during the war against the Zulus—*Die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgerichte.*

From Sedan the 2d and 3d German armies turned westward towards Paris, through the richest French territory and upon the most beautiful of French public roads. Paris, the center of European culture and art, the Mecca of all foreign tourists, had been turned into the most formidable of the world's fortresses. The city itself is surrounded by a strong, unsurmountable wall, to which had been added some 18 equally strong forts, each in itself a little fortress and extending in a circumference of 55 miles. This gigantic mass of stones was defended from within by an army of 300,000 men, consisting of the remnant of the escaped regular troops under General Vinoy, together with 115,000 Mobile Guards and 130,000 National Guards; 2,600 fortress cannons plus 124 batteries threatened death and destruction to the approaching enemy. Towards the end of September an army of 250,000 Germans had taken possession of the environment of the French capital; King William's headquarters were located at Versailles, where, 200 years before, the glorious Louis XIV. the destroyer of Germany, had ruled and died.

The Government of National Defense had appointed the greatest orator of France, *Jules Favre*, Minister of Foreign Affairs. He at once issued a proclamation in which he declared the King of Prussia responsible for the continuation of the infamous war, which the Empire had begun, assuring the world that the Republic was determined not to yield an inch of her land nor a stone of her fortresses. Thiers, the diplomatist par excellence, visited at the same time the European courts in order to procure their intervention in behalf of his country. Bismarck replied, emphasizing the fact that in more than twenty wars with France, Germany had never been the aggressor, and demanding for future protection the territory of the two fortresses of Strassburg and Metz. Jules Favre then had a personal interview with Bismarck, using all the persuasive power of his wonderful eloquence to convince the German Chancellor that the French Republic had nothing in common with the French Empire, promising that her future policy should be that of reconciliation if Germany would only be satisfied with money, all the money they had, but



Bismarck's stern logic was never moved by any oratorical effusion: he reckoned with cold facts and repeated his demands. However the provisional government vehemently rejected them, and furiously exclaimed: "Not an inch of our territory!" Its threats were of no avail. On the 9th of September the fortress of Laon capitulated; on the 23d, Toul; on the 27th, Strassburg, the beautiful city, after death and destruction had done their utmost to make further resistance impossible. Only Paris and Metz remained obstinate. By means of carrier pigeons and balloons the capital communicated with the provinces constantly, appealing to the patriotism of all loyal sons of France to assist in the creation of new means of defense. Finally, Leon Gambetta, Minister of Internal Affairs, the ablest and most passionate man of the provisional government, having left Paris in a balloon, appeared in person at the second seat of the government in Tours, in order to take charge of the war operations outside of the capital. Moltke says of him and his undertaking: "France had to pay dearly for its energetic but dilettantic war methods. With rare ability and persistence, Gambetta placed the whole population of the country under arms, but he lacked a uniform plan to organize and guide them. With but little preparation and poorly supplied with the necessary armament, they were sent out with unmerciful cruelty, to struggle disconnectedly against an enemy whose firm discipline and leadership crushed their bravery and devotion. He is responsible for having continued the bloodshed without changing the fate of France." The new Army of the Loire under General La Motterouge was completely routed by the Bavarians under General von der Tann. Orleans, the key to Southern France, was taken possession of and the fortress of Soissons surrendered, thus opening the communication between Paris and Rheims. On the 18th of October the first city near Paris, Chateaudun, was taken by storm, but set on fire by the irregular *Franc-tireurs*, the first serious indication of the coming civil war. For three months these minor fights around Paris continued, the French cannons, in the spirit of wanton destruction, demolishing the most beautiful properties still left intact. The most inter-

esting and at the same time most important occurrence during these days of tedious waiting is the surrender of Metz on the 27th of October, induced by the utter want of provisions, 200,000 soldiers laid down their arms within the walls of the fortress and left the city amidst painful silence in six directions, received by six Prussian army corps, which took them to the German frontier, whence they scattered, a second migration of nations over the Fatherland. History nowhere records a similar case, a mighty army surrendering an inaccessible fortress. Bazaine joined Napoleon at Wilhelmshöhe, but was afterwards placed under arrest for treason, and before a French military court sentenced to death; sentence was afterwards commuted to 20 years' imprisonment, but he escaped to Spain.

During its first three months up to the surrender of Metz the war of 1870 appears like a spectacular drama of melancholy grandeur. The hasty declaration of war is followed by two weeks of anxious expectation during which the armies are gathering along the Rhine; then follow the three first battles; again ten days pass in fearful silence, to be broken by the thunderbolts near Metz; another week of uncertain movements ends with the fall of Sedan and the Empire—a grand but awful tragedy. Then for two weeks the tramp, tramp, tramp of regiments is heard on the highway to Paris, finally the surrender of Strassburg and Metz and the migration of prisoners into Germany. But when expectations for peace were ripe, we find a second war at hand, that was to last four months. The war *with the French* people, directed solely against the German army around Paris and instigated and inspired by a single man, Leon Gambetta, a second Napoleon I. in principle, in character and in mind. We may call his undertaking and his methods insane, but we must nevertheless admire his iron will, his genius, his patriotism. Aided by faithful and honest England—honest because it had promised to remain neutral—he armed within a few weeks 600,000 men and procured 1,400 cannons. I shall not enter into the details of this new war, but simply mention that they regained Orleans, for a time at least, and thence proceeded

against the German army from four different directions, from the south, the west, the north, the southeast and from around Paris itself, so that the beleaguered army had constantly to struggle against two enemies, the one inside, the other outside of Paris; and only the lack of training on the part of the new aggressors, as well as the unusually severe winter of 1871, saved the Germans from serious consequences. Moreover, the Metz army had been ordered to the northern part of France to begin operations against the smaller fortresses; they succeeded in taking possession of Verdun, Amiens, Diedenhofen, La Faye, Verdun an Evreux, while the army of Strassburg under General von Werder operated against the fortresses along the upper Rhine, occupying Schlettstadt, Breisach and Dijon, and enclosing the formidable rocky fortress of Belfort, on the Swiss frontier. Thus the army around Paris had solely to depend upon its own resources. But the numerous efforts on the part of the Parisian army to break through the German lines, as well as the heroic aggression of the Army of the Loire under Chanzy, failed with the three battles at Le Mans between the 10th and 12th. So the ingenious plans of Gambetta to detract the attention from Paris to an invasion into South Germany, with the help of Garibaldi and with an army of 100,000 men, did not succeed because General Bourbaki, the ablest of all the French commanders, was defeated by only 45,000 Germans under Werder, and thus the fate of the mighty war was decided. The South German army was saved; Belfort's siege continued. Pursued in the rear by Werder and confronted by the new South German army under Manteuffel, Bourbaki found it now impossible to reach Dijon and to unite with Garibaldi. In his despair he attempted to commit suicide, but failed. General Clinchart took charge of the French troops and crossed the Jura mountains in the dead of winter. Over almost impassable roads of snow and the ice-covered Alps the general hoped to reach the frontier city of Pontarlier, whence he expected to march south, but when his tired, hungry and rebellious troops arrived at Pontarlier it was learned that escape to Southern France was impossible, so that the rest of the army, still number-

ing 90,000 men, resolved to cross the Swiss frontier and to surrender their arms. Two French armies imprisoned in Germany, a third one inclosed in its own capital, and the fourth disarmed upon foreign soil!

During these dark and bitterly cold days of January, '71, when the German people had their attention riveted upon the battlefield before Paris, a great historical event—perhaps the most glorious fruit of the great war—took place at the headquarters of Versailles, namely the establishment of a new German Empire. In order to prevent a German union the war had been instigated, but what Napoleon had worked so hard to prevent was now accomplished; all Germany stood together in arms at the great watch on the Rhine, and the throne of the Bonapartes, cemented with blood, had crumbled into pieces. The people in North and South Germany publicly demanded the incorporation of Alsace and Lorraine into a new united German Empire; and after preliminary friendly discussions largely in reference to the rights and privileges of individual states, the North and South German Houses of Representatives consented to the official proclamation of the new German Empire on the 1st of January, 1871. This great event was followed by the offer of the imperial crown to the Hohenzollerns, rejected in '49 by Frederick William IV. with the words: "An imperial crown can only be won on fields of battle." The time had arrived; at the head of the German people there stood a strong, firm character who had obtained his position in the struggle against the Frankish usurper and his African hordes. After much hesitation on the part of King William as well as on the part of Bismarck, the former accepted the title and the crown. On the 18th of January, 1871, in the great Mirror Hall at the Castle of Versailles, the solemn proclamation of the new German Empire took place, exactly 170 years after King Frederick I. had placed the crown as the first King of Prussia upon his own head. A large number of German princesses, generals and Ministers, together with the representatives of all the German regiments from around Paris, with their flags and standards, were present.

After divine service King William read the proclamation of the Empire. Chancellor Count Bismarck followed with a proclamation to the German people, and the Grand Duke of Baden closed with cheers for the new Emperor. Thus the dream of the best men in German lands was fulfilled. In the year 1870 the French lost an Emperor; the year 1871 gave to the Germans an Emperor and an Empire—no longer the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation, but a truly national structure, founded by the omnipotent will of the German people and the free consent of her princes. And the fact that all this happened amidst the splendor of the greatest French castle, where many a private expedition against Germany had been planned, proved the historical prerogative of the venerable bearer of the new German crown. Upon the field of battle German unity and the German imperial crown had been welded.

And now to the surrender of Paris. With the beginning of January the German artillery had begun a fearful cannonade against the forts. Upon thousands of wagons the huge bombshells had arrived and were piled up mountain high. After the complete destruction and ruin of the forts, the city itself was bombarded, creating consternation and terror everywhere, and forcing the beleaguered troops to another sortie on the 19th of January. Ninety thousand French troops fought against 22,000 Germans, but with a loss of nearly 4,000 men the former had to retreat behind the walls of Paris. The last attempt of a break for liberty had failed, and General Trochu resigned his position as commander-in-chief of the army. The mob began to ransack the city of Paris, French fought against French, the end had come. Moreover, the most dreaded of all enemies, hunger, had established its supreme reign in the great capital, followed by the unfailing satellites, disease and pestilence. One ounce of horse meat and ten ounces of bread were the best and the most that could be obtained per head; dogs, cats and rats were considered delicacies. Finally the animals of the Zoölogical Garden were sacrificed on the altar of patriotism. A pair of camels were sold at from 4,000 to 5,000 francs, the two elephants at 27,000 francs;



a pound of elephant meat cost from 25 to 30 francs, a pound from the trunk 40 francs; a bear was sold at 500 francs, two porcupines at 100, etc. But all that was only for rich gourmands. Horse meat was sold toward the end of the siege at 5 francs a pound, dog meat at 8, a cat at 15, a rabbit at 50, a turkey at 150, an egg at 5, a rat at 2, a pound of butter at 160, a cabbage head at 60. Under such circumstances it required more than good nature to stay in Paris. The government was finally forced to surrender. Jules Favre agreed with Bismarck and Moltke upon an armistice of three weeks, on the 28th of January, for the purpose of allowing the national government time to present the whole question to a National Assembly to be elected and called to decide upon the condition of surrender and peace. This Assembly was to meet in Bordeaux. All the forts are to be delivered up to the enemy, as well as the troops on land and water and their entire armament. The city of Paris pays within two weeks 200,000,000 francs. But Paris was not yet to be occupied by the Germans. Gambetta was enraged over such conditions; he knew that there were still over 500,000 men under arms, and he was determined to continue the struggle to the bitter end, but his persistence led to his resignation. On the 16th of February Thiers was elected President of the new government by the Bordeaux Assembly, and his sole aim was to obtain peace even at the price of the victors. Alsace and Lorraine, with Strassburg, and Metz, had to be given up, a part of Paris was to be occupied by 30,000 German soldiers until peace was ratified, and 5,000,000,000 francs of war indemnity were to be paid by France. The preliminary peace was signed at Versailles on the 26th of February with the following additional conditions: The first 1,000,000,000 francs is to be paid within the year 1871, the rest within three years after the ratification of peace. The Germans are to vacate Paris and the forts on the left side of the Seine, then gradually the various provinces of France. Six departments in the East, together with Balfort, which surrendered on the 18th of February, remain occupied by not more than 50,000 Germans until the full indemnity is paid. Immediately after the acceptance of preliminary

peace by the National Assembly the final negotiations are to be entered upon at Brussels. The armistice is extended till the 12th of March.

The most painful of all conditions was the entrance of the German army into the holy, invincible city of Paris; the most renowned and beautiful parts of the city around the Elysean fields were to be occupied by 30,000 German soldiers. On the 1st of March the Emperor William, surrounded by his splendid suite of generals and princes, entered at the head of his troops the Bois de Boulogne greeted at its entrance by the triumphal arch of Napoleon I. established *à toutes les glories de la France*. The Parisians received them with silent but wrathful countenances, submitting unwillingly to an enforced hospitality which they had to offer the enemy. More than 50,000 soldiers of all kinds visited the city unarmed in order to enjoy its treasures of art and to have a general good time. But these well merited pleasures only lasted a little over a day, for the Assembly at Bordeaux accepted the conditions of peace with an overwhelming majority on the 1st of March, and on the 2d the documents were signed by both parties, so that the German troops had to leave Paris in the early morning of the 3d of March. King William sent the following dispatch to the Empress in Berlin: "So far the great work is completed, wrought by the victorious struggles of seven months, thanks to the bravery, devotion and perseverance of our incomparable army in all its parts, and thanks to the self-sacrificing spirit of the Fatherland. The Lord of hosts has everywhere visibly blessed our undertaking and granted us this honorable peace. To Him be honor! To the army and the Fatherland my most heartfelt gratitude!"

The final peace negotiations were definitely terminated on the 6th of May, in Frankfort-on-the-Main, with slight changes in the details of the conditions. While Germany was celebrating its glorious victories, laying wreaths of laurels upon the graves of her 130,000 sons killed during the war and distributing honors and possessions to those who had inaugurated and wrought out the great plans, France descended deeper and deeper into the

mire of her misery. The mob of Paris, called the National Guards, was allowed to keep its arms against the warning of Bismarck; as soon as the Germans had left they took possession of the city, barricaded the streets and declared war on the new government. A new act in the great drama began, the civil war. Marshall MacMahon took Paris, at the head of an army of 80,000 men, inch by inch; the Communists, enraged at their defeat, set fire to the most beautiful buildings of the holy city, burning down the Palais Royal, the Tuileries and the City Hall. Fully eight days the struggle had lasted when the last fortification on the hill of Cheamont was taken by storm, MacMahon having lost over 7,000 of his soldiers. Such was the aftermath of the siege by the barbarian Germans. Only after the Commune was completely overthrown, the new government was fully established. On the 31st of August, 1871, Thiers was elected President of the French Republic; after his resignation in 1873 MacMahon followed, likewise resigning in 1879, as did his successor, the honest citizen, Grévy, in 1887. Carnot, the fourth President, was murdered in 1894; his successor, Casimir Perier abdicated after a short time. Of the present incumbent of the French Presidency but little can be said. Thus the Republic continues; neither the Orleanists nor Bonapartists have ability enough to establish the monarchy. The great men of 1870-71 are dead; let us hope to God that the Republic may last, increasing in the virtues of its Huguenot stock in earnest endeavors for peace and in works of good will toward men.

## II.

### GLADSTONE'S BUTLER.\*

BY PROF. JACOB COOPER, S. T. D., D. C. L., RUTGERS COLLEGE.

#### (a) ANALOGY THE FOUNDATION OF REASONING.

All Reasoning except Demonstrative derives its entire cogency from Analogy. For it is the comparison between the knowledge derived from the facts already known, and that we are seeking to establish in the new domain we are investigating. There can be no step taken in advance without a basis on which to stand, and the certainty of our progress depends upon the similarity of the ground before us to that already passed over.

There are no two things in the realm of material nature which are the same. They may resemble in all degrees even to the extent of being indiscernible. But the matter of which they are composed and the space they occupy must of necessity be different. Hence nothing can be identical save with itself; and therefore personality can attach only to the individual whether this be spiritual or material.

But while no two things can be the same they may be so much alike that no difference can be discerned by us, and, therefore, in loose language they are called the same. Similarity is the only basis of comparison between the known and the unknown, and therefore for our inductive reasonings. And since this may exist in every degree from the remotest resemblance to indiscernible difference it determines the degree of accuracy in the conclusions of every scientific process. For all science is built up by the classification of individual existences or facts which agree in likeness, and therefore can be placed under one category. Without

\*The works of Joseph Butler, D. C. L. Edited by the Right Honorable W. E. Gladstone. Vol. I., *The Analogy*; Vol. II., *The Sermon*. To be followed by a third volume of *Discussions*. Macmillan & Co., London and New York. 1896.

this resource of grouping no progress in knowledge could be made except through the enumeration of particulars, and then memory would be the sole measure of intellectual ability. No inference could be drawn from one instance to another except from the fact that these agreed either in their qualities or influences. Hence the basis both of Inductive and Deductive Logic, whether formal or applied, is found in Analogy. The Middle Term or fundamental principle is assumed in Deduction; and the special instance declared to belong to the general class because of its resemblance in some known particulars; and therefore it is held to possess the others, which are as yet only conjectured, by virtue of its resemblance. Induction is the counterpart of this process. For both forms of Logic are merely the process of analogy employed conversely. In inductive reasoning the new instance is compared with another somewhat better known, but not sufficiently so to make it a certain norm. This in turn has been already classified because of its similarity to another still more obvious, and this process is carried back to axiomatic principles. For by this agreement between two facts thus carried back to one more obvious, the principle of similarity is broadened by each successive instance until a general truth is established in which the certainty depends upon resemblance between a class whose members cannot be discriminated. The instances agree as far as it is possible for us to know, and the application of this principle, while broadened, gives strength from the mutual support of its parts in successive instances until a general fact is established which becomes the basis of Deduction. Such is the beginning of science, whether the word be taken in its strict meaning or in the loose application of daily life. For the process of gaining knowledge is the same, no matter what be the subject or by whom it be applied. The syllogistic form is the rule by which men reason, whether it be the uneducated rustic who has never heard of the name, or Locke, who ridicules the process while unconsciously employing it in his reasonings for its subversion.

In the science of pure abstraction, which deals with the relations of space, we have the reasoning from objective identity.



Such employ the relations of magnitude on which geometry is based, and when the mind once apprehends these in their absolute truth every new instance of their employment is only a subjective application of the same relation. But here the identity is only the model, the Platonic Idea, which each thinker grasps with different degrees of accuracy depending upon his ability and culture. So when the terms of the reasoning process are assumed, and used subsequently in the same sense, their application is always a matter of certainty to the degree that they conform to the logical process. For the basis of comparison is fixed, and the new instance is the same truth differing as before only in the subjective apprehension. Here the resemblance of the instances, or the analogy of relations, is complete; and therefore there can be no mistake in the result, provided the formal reasoning be correct. So in those instances when the middle term, which is the principle of comparison, is arrived at by what the logicians call *per enumerationem simplicem*, where all possible applications are known and included under one term. But here we have merely an analytical judgment, where we deduce from a statement what we have already thought into it. No new knowledge in concrete things can be achieved by this method, and it can be used with advantage only as a convenient register of facts for ready application or for instruction.

But all other kinds of reasoning come under the principle of Analogy, or resemblance of that which is partially unknown to that which is more or less completely known. The certainty of the result in every case will depend upon the truth of the premises, and their agreement which begets a new truth as the consequence of this union. The procedure from the known to the unknown is warranted by the assumption of the accepted truths of causality and uniformity in Nature. This is the process of evolution in the progress of each science, in the common affairs of life, and in their joint influence on the elevation of the human race. The present with its accumulated knowledge and experience is the middle-term by which the new term of the future is to be tested, and this can be effected only by the close-

ness of the analogy between them. This process has been continuous and unvarying from the beginning of the world. If, therefore, there is to be a future, we are forced to believe that the same law of uniformity will continue because there are no intimations of any other principle obtaining, and so we are shut up to this. For if there be a future it must be a development from the present; like it as the bud and embryo are to the fruit and the mature spirit.

But will there be a future? is the question which above all others commands our attention. Is there any evidence deducible from the course of nature which leads us to expect a future life? The proof for this, if there be any, cannot be demonstrative as in mathematics, where we postulate our own definitions and the conditions for their application. We can postulate nothing concerning the future, except by analogy with the past depending on the general uniformity observable in nature, and the evidence that all parts of space and time belong to one general scheme. There is *a priori* evidence of this because we see no line, either local or temporal, where this uniformity ceases and a new order begins; and so we are not permitted to fix any bound ourselves. Neither, again, can the proof be of the nature of analytic evidence, where the answer is virtually contained in the statement of the question. Nor yet again can it be of the character of scientific tests, where all the elements are coexistent and constant, save as we subject them to experiment. It must then necessarily be of that kind which arises between the known past, including the present and the unknown future as a continuance of the same scheme—a step in advance rendered possible by the firmness of our present standing. This is a natural action of the mind inseparable from its activity, one in which we fall into unconsciously, and which no amount of sophistry can prevent us from clinging fast to by the anchor of hope.

#### (b) BUTLER'S ANALOGY OF RELIGION.

Bishop Butler's "Analogy" is one of those books which are written for all time. It does not seem to be the product of any

particular age, save as the period when it was written was one when there was a loud call for plain speaking in defense of religious truth. For it was a time when unbelief, loose morals, and a polite contempt for revealed religion, were but poorly counteracted by a venal clergy whose daily life was a halting witness for the truth of their profession, and whose doctrine was a cowardly compromise with the enemies of faith. It voices the thoughts of a culture which recognizes this faith in an unseen world as the basis of all virtue and progress, as the strength of character and foundation of hope amid the discouragements and frailties of this life. Like every great genius, Butler appears to say what the thoughtful in all ages wished to say, and therefore creates the impressions with those who follow his argument that they could say the same. It is the gathering up of scattered fragments of thought patent to every reflecting mind when taken singly, and articulating them so deftly together that they form a chain of proof, and, contrary to the usual fact, this chain is stronger than any one of its links, because the strength of each could never be known until it was seen in the place for which it showed itself fitted by its relations as soon as located. How much a truly great man knows in advance of his age cannot be computed. The wise man is the prophet just to the degree that he understands the workings of the human heart. He "speaks for" others as far as he can voice their thoughts and needs, as well as in "advance" of them by foretelling what is to come. He reads the inmost thoughts of men; he looks down into the roots of things; he sees the inner forces which control nature because he is in communion with them, being himself an integral part of the working power which moves the world. The forces which control any movement are various, many of them minute, and their action complicated. Superficial observers err because they seize on a few which appear to them prominent. But while they may be so, they are joint forces with many others and their action is modified by those of less energy. As in the law of the resultant, the smaller forces are still sufficiently powerful to change the

direction of those which are thought to be controlling. Hence the conclusions of superficial thinkers are erroneous because they make no allowance for the small elements which combine with the main ones to produce in moral forces an unexpected resultant. There are, for example, at least 43 forces in the solar system; some of them very feeble comparatively, but still powerful enough to produce a remainder in all the calculation of paths and revolutionary periods among the planets. This illustrates the principle alluded to by Goethe, when he said that "whenever the human intellect divides nature it leaves a remainder." For there are forces so minute and essences so subtle that man cannot grasp them all; but the measure of his capacity is shown by the degree of completeness with which he enumerates and utilizes such as can be known. It was Butler's great merit that he was able to seize on an immense array of facts bearing on his subject, which, taken in isolation, had been deemed too trivial for notice by other authors, and so combine them that they mutually support each other, and thus by their joint effort produce an overpowering effect on every fair-minded reader. This is a most marked peculiarity of the "Analogy," compared with any other treatise on the nature and proofs of a future life. The impression on the mind of the reader is well-nigh unaccountable. The author makes out his case while granting everything his adversaries claim, stating their objections more strongly than any one of them had ever been able to do, and, at the same time, showing their utter futility. This is done in such a way as to make evident both the reserve force of the writer and of his subject, and while this is the course of honesty, it also becomes a powerful argument in itself. Hence, whatever other views may have been held by those who are hostile to the author's position, there is only one as to his fairness both in the statement of his own views and those of his opponents. For this reason those who are in sympathy with his theory feel assured of two things, viz: That the position of the doubter is utterly demolished by the skirmish line without calling out the reserve forces; and that his own is impregnable when it can be defended by only the insig-

nificant contingent. For Butler does not pretend to cover the entire ground of Apologetics. He seems to have purposely chosen a point of view which others had neglected because they thought it unworthy of occupancy.

The fate of Butler's writings has been like that of a few other authors, who, to employ a misused expression, "have lived before their time." Those who interpret the controlling thoughts of mankind speak to the select few in every age who are able to comprehend them. Hence the full meaning of a true seer is not understood, and therefore not appreciated until in the course of years the general culture of the race has risen to the level of the great writer's thoughts. It is a characteristic of Divine Revelation that its full meaning can never be exhausted; repeated and careful study reveals meanings long hidden and awaiting the time of their interpretation when the world is ready to receive them. Just as the riches of the earth, the deposits of the precious metals, and the concentrated energies of coal and oil, of electricity, and doubtless of as many other exponents of forces yet undreamed of by science, await the time when men can understand and utilize them; even so the words of Divine Wisdom, whether uttered by that prophetic vision which God gives His special heralds, or that unmiraculous vision which accompanies transcendent talents. For these utterances have a wealth of meaning, a quickening energy which will never be comprehended or employed to the full measure of their significance until the education of the race be complete. Butler spoke to a select few with such modesty, even timidity, that his contemporaries did not discern the prophet they had among them. The popularity of some writers increases with a slow but steady growth, which is a thermometer showing the rise of man in the scale of intelligence and virtue. Homer, Plato, Aristotle, Bacon, Shakespeare, Leibnitz and Kant grow more popular with the lapse of centuries. The reason of this is not far to seek. They see farther into the hidden processes which control the world than others, and only a few are able to understand the most important truths they utter even when ex-



pounded. These few in turn interpret them to others, and after a while the whole world may be able to grasp the message which at the time of utterance seemed an enigma. But these great geniuses had their exoteric doctrines; they expressed part of their message in terms on a level with the common understanding, were popular to that extent, and valued for what was really of the least consequence in their utterances. Prophecy has usually a double fulfillment, and most persons are content when they can grasp the primary and more obvious meaning. Butler was appreciated by his contemporaries to a certain degree. The modest and painfully shy author, who could but imperfectly explain himself in public, and who believed that a serious subject could not be discussed properly in a promiscuous company, was more admired than understood while he lived. His "Sermons at the Rolls," doubtless the most profound and significant as expositions of religious philosophy of any that have ever been uttered by an uninspired preacher, attracted so little attention that they were not sought for publication. Doubtless the few lawyers and judges who, as a matter of form, attended the religious services which were especially held for them, heard the text, scanned with some curiosity the bloodless countenance of their preacher, and were lulled to sleep by his halting accents. When the service was over each awakened attendant probably remarked to his neighbor: "What a profound discourse Mr. Butler gave us to-day;" and received a hearty yea in response, by which both interlocutors prided themselves on the reputation for profundity they had established with their fellows. But the "Sermons" slept in the author's "barrel" for several years, and would have been forgotten had he not thrust his hand, at random as we would infer from his own statement,\* among the large mass, taken the fifteen which first rewarded his delving, and given them to the public. The rest of this priceless treasure seem to

\* It may be proper just to advertise the reader that he is not to look for any particular reason for the choice of the greatest part of these discourses; these being taken from amongst many others preached in the same place through a course of eight years, being in great measure accidental. Vol. II., 39.

have been a prey to paper moths, until a century after they were written, when they fell into the hands of the wife of a country rector, who used them to light her kitchen fire!

The "Analogy" fared somewhat better. The favor of Queen Caroline, who desired the reputation of a *bas bleu*; of the Lord Chancellor and Archbishop Secker, and of Dr. S. Clarke, of whom only the last could completely understand it, gave the work such a send-off that the literary world thought itself compelled to buy and read the Lord Bishop's book, and through personal vanity make one another believe they comprehended its argument. The words of the wise are ever heard in secret. They were understood sufficiently to find a few willing readers. The power of the author began to be felt. Men read the book and experienced a strange fascination. They returned to it again, asking themselves where its force lay. Certainly not in its awkward and even crabbed style. Not in pretentious claims at demonstrative reasoning. Not in any new or startling theories. Its materials were simple, its arguments apparently commonplace. It had neither the fierceness of controversy to arouse attention, nor the rancor of personal abuse to keep alive the interest in its arguments. It seemed to concede so much to the free thinker that he thought himself the admitted master of the field. But gradually the fact dawned upon the reader that unbelief has no cause and its advocates no standing, because they have conceded enough in what is admitted to be necessary to the conduct of daily life to destroy their own argument. The free thinker must deny that rewards and punishments are the basis of civil society, and that man is responsible, which renders all conduct indifferent; or he must admit the analogy between the natural and revealed systems is complete. This is all that Butler contends for; and, therefore, to oppose him is either absurd or dishonest.

It is perhaps impossible to describe the impression this book makes upon the sympathetic reader. For each element of the argument appears insignificant in itself and is so familiar that it awakens no interest. But somehow as he reads on he is un-

consciously carried along with the writer and convinced. Butler is so fair, concedes so much to his opponents and still combines his arguments so skillfully that each grain of the proof coöperates in producing an effect which is irresistible. The candor of the author is conspicuous by the contrast with the *finesse* of his opponents; and this proves the strongest argument of all, because it shows what temper the Christian faith in a future life produces, and causes the dishonesty of unbelievers to answer itself by displaying its legitimate effect upon their character.

No book of apologetics has been found so hard to criticise by those who profess to doubt a future life or question the cogency of Butler's argument in its support. For every thoughtful man is compelled to admit the data on which Butler frames his argument. And should any one deny them he will have to watch continually lest he write himself a knave or a fool, for they are a necessary basis from which he is forced to fight. For he cannot deny the author's premises without abjuring all that distinguishes honesty and culture from falsehood and savagery. And while constrained to admit his premises, doubters cannot state their own objections to the doctrine of a future life so strongly as he does for them. And yet he so deftly forges his defensive armor for Revealed Religion that they can find no joints through which to shoot their arrows of criticism. They may deny that he makes out his case, but can find no proof to substantiate this denial, and leave him in possession of the field. They may try to pick a flaw in his reasoning, but find that all their artillery has dislodged is only the rust and grime on his armor; and the net result is to make it brighter by removing the incrustation. They attack single points which are unessential when taken out of their connection, and because they fail to see that it is their linked dependence which gives them cogency, the labored effort displays only their own ignorance. Nearly all his critics employ the shallow artifice of patronizing—a favorite trick of unbelief at all times—by praising the author's life and motives. But when retreating from the attack they still proclaim themselves victorious over an argument which they

have not understood. This is a victory easily gained, though attended with the consciousness that the world sees through the sophistry. The gist of all the objections raised against the "Analogy," from Martineau to Matthew Arnold, is that they accuse him of not proving what he did not attempt to do. They mistake his purpose, which is to show that there is an analogy between the course of nature, as shown in what we actually experience growing out of our physical and moral constitution and the enactments of civil society founded thereon, and that of a future life as disclosed in Revelation. The purpose is not to demonstrate a future life from axiomatic principles as Euclid does geometry, or Newton the movements of the solar system. Logical reasoning cannot do this because it is not a matter of pure science or deduction from experience. As a result of this misunderstanding, all the criticisms, as Mr. Gladstone has so trenchantly shown,\* are merely paralogsms. The critics could neither understand the general purpose of the author, the trend of his arguments, or their own sophistries, and wearied themselves beating the air. For a specimen of most keen and drastic criticism, commend us to the Grand Old Man's handling of Arnold, whose egotism consisted, in part, in mistaking his own critical taste for the *zeitgeist* of the age! Truly, if Arnold were alive to feel the flaying, and his egotistical folly not beyond the reach of medicine, he would be as much delighted as the eels whose good fortune it was to be skinned by dear old Izaak Walton.

(c) Gladstone's Edition of Butler's Works.

Butler's Analogy has been published one hundred and sixty years. In that time the subject of philosophical evidence of a future life has engaged the most vigorous intellects; and the department of Teleology, which for a good while has been the chief battleground between belief and unbelief, has been especially developed. It is doubtful if Butler was acquainted with the works of that profoundest thinker of modern times—except himself—Leibnitz. There is at least no evidence from the Analogy that he had used the works of Continental thinkers living

\* Contemporary Review, Nov.-Dec., 1895.

since the revival of learning. Doubtless he set before himself a unique plan which did not call for a reference to the investigations of other apologists. He took the elements which were common property of all reflecting persons, and constructed his argument without help from any other writer. It is possible that the statement of Origen which he quotes\* may have suggested the idea of the Analogy. It is also barely possible that a similar thought expressed by the Dutch writer (Nieuwyntyt) which doubtless proved a fruitful seed to Paley in his *Natural Theology*, was suggestive to Butler. But it is far more likely that the view of the moral government of the universe considered as a scheme was his independent conception, just as was the supremacy of Conscience. The only aid that the statement of Origen could have given him would be to show that the difficulties which meet one in accepting the Holy Scriptures as the word of God are just such as must be encountered by a person who believes this world to have come from Him. This embraces only a very small part of the "Analogy" and does not amount to a proof for a future life, while Butler's contention is that the actual government of the world is evidently disciplinary and a part of a scheme embracing all time.

If we should conclude that Butler borrowed his system from another because similar ideas had been suggested before, we might find analogies without number in Plato's *Republic* and *Laws* between the government of Deity on earth and in a future state. Such thoughts are native to all deeply reflecting spirits. It is the prerogative of genius to shed light upon those thoughts which have become old and worn. And while we have competent authority for the statement that "there is nothing new under the sun," still the power to quicken with a fresh and endless life that which is trite is a new creation. If we should admit that Butler did this, it will in no respect derogate from the magnitude of his service. And since truth is both the property and the object of pursuit of all good men, their investigations are component parts,

\*Χρὴ μὲν τοι γὰρ τὸν ἀπ᾽ παραδεξάμενον τοῦ κτίσαντος τὸν κόσμον εἶναι ταύτας τὰς γράφας πεπεισθαι, ὅτι ὅσα περὶ τῆς κτίσεως ἀπαντᾷ τοῖς ζητοῦσι τὸν περὶ αὐτῆς λόγον, ταῦτα καὶ περὶ τῶν γραφῶν.



and exhibit facets of this jewel. Hence, however unique the plan of the "Analogy" may be, it can receive side lights from all departments of philosophy and physical science.

The period since Bishop Butler's works were published has been most prolific in valuable contributions in the lines of Apologetics in Theology, and Teleology in Philosophy. These have made more distinct progress in that time than in any other equal period in the history of the world. For these reasons his works should be edited with the help of all progress which has been made in the knowledge of this life as a precursor of the one for which analogy teaches that the present is a preparation. Of editions so-called we have had no lack. Most of these, however, were of the bare text, and more properly reprints. Some of them were accompanied with analyses and questions fitting for text-books in schools. Few books on theological or philosophical subjects have passed through so many reprints or been used so widely as text-books in schools and colleges as the "Analogy." One large body of Christians in our country has made it one of the books indispensable for every theological student to pass examination in before he can be admitted to the Gospel ministry. None of these scarcely claim to be editions, or, if they do, no real student of the author would suspect the fact. For they are superficial, and merely aim to interpret the meaning to the grasp of the ordinary mind. They do not conceive it as a whole, nor see its bearing on the real question of analogical proof. While very useful in bringing the more obvious parts of the book to the comprehension of the multitude, they do not see in it an exhaustive summary of those fundamental truths revealed in nature which, by their agreement with Divine revelation corroborate its appeals to the conscience and make transgression inexcusable. They are like the handbooks of science which diffuse valuable information in each department of physics, but give the facts in insolation without their deeper signification as parts of the Cosmos, for the comprehension of which the majority even of the educated have neither the leisure nor the ability.

Despite the fact therefore that so long a period, and one so

rich in progress, has elapsed, no edition in any proper sense as incorporating these results has been published. Those which come the nearest to this desideratum are the "Analogy" by Barnes, which is enriched with a valuable Prolegomenon; and those of Fitzgerald, Steere and Whewell, of the "Analogy" or "Sermons." These have done their work well so far as they proposed. They contain clear and vigorous expositions of parts of the author's views and enter into his spirit. But they are deficient in that which is so much desired, the *tout ensemble* of all Butler's works. For he considers the present and future as parts of one grand scheme, which combines the life of man on earth and in the existence beyond as forming one system, subjected to the same law and controlled by one Lawgiver. Such an editor has been needed as could utilize all the materials at hand, with the comprehensive spirit which dictated the original work. The writer has felt this so strongly that he has urged, at various times, four persons who, in breadth of intellect and culture as well as sympathy with Butler's views, were known to be able for this task. Three of these were President Woolsey, Prof. G. T. E. Shedd, and M. Barthélemy St. Hillaire. These all pleaded literary engagements already in progress, as well as age too far advanced to undertake a work requiring the best powers and extended leisure. But the fourth, who stands at the head of the scholars and thinkers as well as the statesmen of this century, had already, without the writer's knowledge, made preparation for this very work before application to him was made. And now that release from the cares of state permit, he consecrates the results of his rich experience and elegant culture to this much needed service. To the many services which he has rendered to religion, to statesmanship and to elegant literature, an adequate edition of the greatest religious philosopher of any age would be a fitting crown. Every person has full confidence that the venerable W. E. Gladstone, if spared to complete the work he has begun by the supplementary volume promised, will give the world an edition worthy of Butler, which is the greatest commendation that is possible. Possessed of every advantage of

talent and culture, of devotion to the truths of revealed religion, with an encyclopædic knowledge, an energy for work which knows no diminution from age; with a catholicity of spirit which acknowledges all that is pure and true and good in every branch of Christendom or Theistic faith, he is the one above all others living since Butler's time who will be acknowledged as the proper person for his editor.

(d) BUTLER'S REASONING RESTS UPON THE HYPOTHESIS OF  
A UNITARY SCHEME IN NATURE.

The prevailing idea in all that Butler has published is that this life is a part of one general scheme which pervades all time and space and is the work of one Omnipotent Author. This is the special conception of the "Analogy," while the purpose of the "Sermons" is to show that all men have a common bond between them; that their interests and their destiny are identical because they are under one scheme of government. This scheme which embraces all things is the One of the Greek philosophy, and in fact is the root idea of all philosophic thought since man began to speculate. How the One becomes the many and they remain distinct in their individuality is the problem of existence from Plato to Leibnitz, whose thoughts have been the seeds to germinate in all other men's minds, and embodies all that is significant in metaphysics, as well as underlies every phase of religious thought, whether natural or revealed. David's harp and the Sybil's leaves, though they sound different notes and often not in harmony with each other, are united in the theme that all parts of the universe and the experiences of rational agents whether in the present or a future life, are united under one system embracing:

" One God, one law, one element,  
And one far-off divine event  
To which the whole creation moves."\*

Herein theism, pantheism, Revelation unite their common forces to oppose unbelief, pessimism and agnosticism. For what-

\* Tennyson : In Memoriam.

ever elevates human nature inspires it with hope and makes it strong to meet the trials of life, segregates itself from that which lowers the aims of man by endeavoring to prove that life is not worth living. If, however, all existence is a scheme, and design prevails—which are assumptions necessary to render science possible and give human conduct moral quality—then each period of our individual existence must be considered indissolubly connected with every other. For the order of nature, as far as it appears above our horizon, is development. One stage is preparatory to another and cannot be isolated. Every analogy of the physical world teaches this. For each particle of matter is connected by attraction with every other; each stage of growth is necessary to the succeeding, even as it is the effect of that which has gone before. The bud swells into the flower; the flower drops when it has nourished the embryo fruit. This<sup>o</sup> in turn yields the seed to propagate itself indefinitely. So the protoplasm or cell develop into the embryo organ; the imperfect body becomes ready for a separate existence. The rudimentary members and sense organs grow to fitness for use under the direction of independent volition. The child plays, the youth gains knowledge, the young man becomes rich in experience for future activities. The mature man disciplines his character by self-denial and the performance of duty for its own sake. This process continues as far as we can watch it. But, unless there be a future life, the discipline and knowledge which fit us for an advanced stage when this fitness has become complete, there is an absolute loss of the painfully acquired adaptation for its more perfect exercise. For if our existence be confined to this world we have the strange, the unnatural spectacle of a man who, by constant watchfulness and the wisdom acquired through many failures, has become fit to live, but must be annihilated when he has but just learned how to live. If there is no place for its display the accumulated power is hopelessly lost. The uniformity of nature's action is destroyed; the scheme according to which all has been effected hitherto is broken off at once, and a wholly different order of nature supervenes. It may be said in reply:

We have no proof that the soul exists after the death of the body, or that its activities are not wholly conditioned by its alliance with a material organization; that we do not know but that the forces which are displayed by the living organism are immanent in matter, and so, when dissolution of this takes place, the energy belonging to each particle goes with the same to compose an entirely different being. Two remarks may be pertinent here. One is that if nothing can be proved affirmatively by the analogical method employed, nothing can be negatively. There is an exact balancing, and no advantage is gained by him who doubts a future life. Another is that Butler does not say that this line of argument *demonstrates* a future life; but that if there is any probability, however little, *for*, and none whatever *against* this view, then the probability ought to be made our rule of action. For in our daily life we are often compelled to act on what, in the main, has the greater degree of probability. In fact, there are very few, if any, matters pertaining to our action which admit of demonstrative proof. Here comes the force of analogy. All the frame of nature evidently belongs to one system indissolubly connected together. The course of development, as far as we can trace it, makes each stage preparatory. The difference between the protoplasm and the full-grown fœtus, and again the embryo before birth and the full-grown man, is as great as that between our present life and one a stage in advance, *as far as we can see*, and our ignorance cannot be taken to establish a negative proof. And the proof from analogy, whatever weight it may have in itself, is not counterbalanced by any in opposition. But, on the contrary, every system of religious doctrine, every accepted revelation, asserts of the future life which it professes to disclose that this will be a realization of what is hoped for in the present one, and will be a continuance in the line, and from this point where, the preparation at death has fitted for action. Analogy has been the mode of procedure invariably up to this point, and all grounds of reasoning from which we can draw an inference project it into the future.



(e) REVELATION NOT INTENDED TO SATISFY MERE CURIOSITY.

The idea that Revelation should clear up difficulties is proper ; but the question may be naturally asked : Should it clear up all that meet us ? If this be demanded we make *ourselves*, and not the Divine Spirit, the criterion of what is proper for us to know. This is so absurd that the simple statement is its own refutation. Two questions seem preliminary to any such demand. Do we utilize all the knowledge we have touching our duty to the Supreme Being ? and would we therefore be profited if all we desire were made known to us ?

A scheme which embraces the whole of two worlds and all time for its unfolding must contain much that we cannot understand. Daily experience proves only too painfully our ignorance, even in regard to much of that which most nearly concerns us and is most level to our comprehension. There is not a single department of science which seems to be more than in its infancy ; none in which that which is unknown is not out of all proportion greater than that which is understood. The organisms of the tiniest animalcule, the physical constitution of the moat which floats in the sunbeam, the structure of any small part of our own bodies, the psychological relation of the spiritual nature to the material, the mode by which the soul bridges the chasm between itself and matter, whether there be a material world, and if so, do we know reality or only phenomena ? Any one of these and countless other questions show us that our present condition is one of ignorance. Hence it is not strange that there should be depths which we cannot fathom in the scheme which embraces the relations of both worlds to each other, when we confessedly know so little of that which is continually before our eyes. If a system of religion or philosophy should profess to make all its parts plain this would at once stamp it as both false and unsuited to our present condition. Meantime, we are compelled to act on what knowledge we possess. For we must always bear in mind that there is no escape from the condition in which we find ourselves, whether this be

such as we would have chosen or not. We find ourselves here with certain surroundings and with a definite work to perform, under conditions which we did not create and which we cannot nullify or change. It is a condition of ignorance, imperfection in physical organization leading to countless ills, and a constant liability to offend against that moral law which our consciences tell us to be right. This is true alike of the individual and the race. But, connected with the imperfection, there is also the feeling that we are entrusted with the responsibility of our own destiny, so that we can make ourselves better or worse, in fact, no one but ourselves can do this. Hence, as we are imperfect—and there is within each man a pervading desire for advance in all that can improve our condition—every portion of our life is disciplinary. No one has yet arrived at the best estate of which he is capable in any period. And each period being evidently adapted to fit for the succeeding one, and none of them having accomplished what we reach after, it is plain that if our present existence is part of a scheme, there must be another life to complete the work begun here. For this is evidently disciplinary and of that sort of trial in which every man is entrusted with the achievement of his own happiness or misery. And when the discipline has been most efficient and the results reached the most satisfactory, when a life of constant struggle against temptation has fitted the character for good service and corresponding happiness, the whole result has been to no purpose, provided the career be closed to death. Such an issue might be allowable under a system of pessimism. But no one who struggles after virtue and elevation of character believes in this revolting doctrine. Nor is it worth while to argue with one who holds this gloomy creed. The only way for him to be consistent on this view is to end this wretched life, and the refuge of suicide being placed within the reach of all it would be the duty of all to avail themselves of this remedy and close the miserable farce. If a demon continued so shocking an existence he must be the embodiment of cruelty and hate. He ought, therefore, to be outwitted, and his plans of evil thwarted. For pessimism rejects immortality

and thinks the present existence the worst that is possible, and therefore it should be escaped from as soon as possible. But this view is so absurd, so contradictory to our best aspirations and degrading to our character, that few will be found willing to accept it in theory or foolhardy enough to adopt it in practice.

(f) PROOFS FOR OPTIMISM IN NATURE.

The world in which we live would be a glorious dwelling place were it not for the miseries which responsible creatures bring upon it by their sins, and our own lives are in the main what we choose to make them. If there be exceptions where the innocent suffer because of the guilt of their parents or the badness of their neighbors, this in no way contradicts the truth that it is voluntary offense which brings misery on the world, and therefore if all were virtuous, if all reached even the standard of their own consciousness of duty, the miseries of which the pessimist complains would gradually disappear; and this tendency—which we can experience so far as we practice right doing—shows that if all wrong doing should utterly cease, so eventually would its consequences.

Moreover, we see that the general tendency to punish sin and protect the innocent are expressed in civil and moral codes exactly in proportion to the growth of intelligence and virtue; that is, to the elevation of the race. While, therefore, these advance *pari passu* as long as their effects can be seen, it is reasonable to assume that the scheme of moral government under which we live will be continued, and with time enough will effect the consummation of this tendency. That the presence of evil under any form, and the powers of the guilty to involve the innocent in suffering are dark problems which we greatly desire to have explained by revelation is certainly true. But it is not at all clear that our conduct would be altered for the better if the reasons for their existence were fully disclosed to us. Deliverance from all the consequences of sin is secured precisely in proportion as the world comes under the moral law, as written in the conscience and corroborated by direct revelation of the Divine Will. If we

wish to know more the method is clear. The more perfect conformity with the moral law in action leads to the more complete comprehension of its provisions. The inspired Teacher declared that if any man will do God's will he shall know the doctrine; that is the truth which underlies all commands. As the law is fulfilled, the miseries which it is intended to counteract disappear, and with them the occasion for its application. The law is not made for the righteous, but for the transgressor; and so, if there were no offenders the end of the law would be attained, and it would become a dead letter. Hence we see here also a perfect analogy between what we know to be true in this life and the scheme disclosed in revelation. By patient study we increase in the knowledge of the material world, and it becomes subject to our power. By obedience to the civil code made for the punishment of the guilty and the protection of the innocent it becomes incorporated into our character, and we know all its provisions in its fulfillment. If we did our whole duty to God and our fellow-men there would be no dark problems, no perplexities in our way. The realization of happiness would be already complete; there would be no misery in the present and no anxiety for the future. The present and the future life unite in one scheme: Perfect obedience to a law which was intended to secure, and already partially realizes, perfect freedom from sin and its coördinate, a happiness equal to our capacity, and increasing with its enlargement!

(j) CONCLUSION: WHAT DOES BUTLER PROVE?

Butler's contentions, like the declarations of Revelation, have their own evidence in their application to the actual condition in which we find ourselves. In their self-evidencing truths lies their strength. The analogy of the present to the future is seen in the order of nature as fast as time realizes it; and the exact correspondence between the truth which we have witnessed in experience, with the continued scheme disclosed by Divine prophecy, attests their common origin and thereby the certainty of a future life.

### III.

## OUR DIVINE SONSHIP.

BY REV. WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER, PH. D.

Our relation to God is doubtless the deepest and most far-reaching of which we are capable. As He is the author of our being and the continual support of our life, we find in this relation the very root and ground of our existence. All our other relations are either comprehended in this, or else they are controlled and modified by it. Hence as we conceive of this relation, so will we conceive of all our other relations, and so finally will we conceive of our entire being, duty and destiny.

Our conception of this relation depends necessarily upon our conception of the terms related, and more especially upon our conception of the first or major term. In our study of it we must hence begin with the idea of the Godhead, with the idea of God as He exists in and by Himself. His character determines His creative activity, and that in turn determines the product of His handiwork. Our conception of his character must, therefore, regulate our conception of that creative activity by which He called the universe into being; and that in turn will regulate our conception of the universe which He created, of the creatures who are His workmanship, and of their relation to Him.

After we have thus formed an idea of the first term of the relation, we will be in a position for a profitable study of the second; and all that we can discover of that will then become helpful in our determination of the relation. As man is a free being, his activity will necessarily affect and modify the relation; but its original character was determined by the divine activity, and it must hence be approached from that side. Man's activity may disturb or even change its character, and must hence be taken into account in our study of what it has become, or of



what it finally will be; but what it originally was, and what it was designed to become, was determined solely by the divine activity. We can rightly estimate even its present character only on the basis of what it originally was. As a mariner, who has been tossed for many days in thick weather and upon an unknown sea, can determine his true position only by taking his latitude from the sun, and by calculating the distance he has drifted from his starting point; so can we determine the true character of this relation, after it has once become modified by the activity of man, only by looking anew to Him who first constituted it, and by estimating how far we have drifted from the ideal which He had in regard to it. We would hence go very far wrong, if we should attempt to study it primarily from the human standpoint. We must begin with the other side; and only after we have determined what it originally was and what it was intended to be, from a careful study of the character of God, can we be in a position to estimate how it was subsequently influenced and modified by our own activity.

The Christian revelation presents God as a Trinity—a Trinity not simply of manifestation, but of essence. If, in imagination, we go back to "the beginning," when, as yet there was no created universe, God is represented as Father, Son and Holy Spirit. He did not begin to be a Father after He had called into being a universe of created intelligences, but He is the Father Almighty from all eternity in the very essence of His being.\* "The relations of Fatherhood and Sonship, which con-

\*" But the relations and activities immanent in the Godhead are less physical than ethical, denoted by terms expressive of the purest emotions and the most creative and dependent relations known to man—Fatherhood and Sonship. These represent love as native to God and as eternal as God. For Him it never began to be, for this is the meaning of the eternal Sonship. The love of man has a potential before it has an actual being; he has the capability of loving before the reality of love; but the love of God had always actual, never a potential being, for only so could it be perfect love. In man love is born of the meeting of the susceptible subject and the attractive object, but in God the absolute love had ever perfect reason and room for being. Man can never know a father's affection until he be a father, or a woman a mother's love unless she be a mother. The capacity may be there, but only the capacity, the

cretely express to us what we count most dear in the nature of God, are eternal and constituent in His very being."\* Nothing short of this is involved in the teaching of the New Testament on the pre-existence and divinity of Jesus Christ. If He is the Son of God, if as Son He is co-equal and co-eternal with the Father, and if He is "the same yesterday, to-day and forever," then from all eternity, before ever the world was, He dwelt in the bosom of the Father as the eternal Son; and God is Father in the very essence of His being, irrespective of all His subsequent activity in the creation. The idea of His Fatherhood, with all that it implies in the way of an eternal communion of love, carries us to the very highest reach of our thought concerning His being.

His Fatherhood conditions and determines His activity as Creator. Not only is He "God, the Father Almighty," before He is "Maker of heaven and earth;" but He became the latter, because from all eternity He was the former. His love as Father was the motive which prompted His creative activity. As Principal Fairbairn so tersely and forcibly puts it, ("God does not love because He created, but He created because He loved.") His creative activity went forth in order that He might extend the blessedness of His own being to a universe of intelligences; and from the very moment of their creation, with the first awakening of conscious, created existence, they rested in the bosom of His love. They did not have need to awaken His fatherly love by anything which they themselves were or did; that love called them into being, and it was theirs because of what He was in Himself.

But if His eternal Fatherhood thus determined His activity as Creator, it must likewise have determined the character of that

aptitude to be, not the actual being. But the Godhead means that as the Fatherhood and the Sonship have been eternal, so also has the love. It signifies that God is not the eternal possibility, but the eternal actuality of love. Hence creation did not mean for God the beginning of love, or even any increase of it. It might be an increase in the objects, but not in the affection." *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology.* Fairbairn, p. 410.

\* *Doctrine and Life.* Stephens, p. 100.

which He created. As His fatherly love went forth in creative activity in order that He might extend the blessedness of His own being to a universe of created intelligences; those intelligences must have been capable by the very fact of their creation of responding to His love, and this response must have implied a being on their part, answering to His own. As the love which called them into being was a Father's love, the love of which they were made capable must have been a filial love, answering to His; or, in other words, they must by their very creation have been fitted to sonship. And this must likewise have been the fundamental characteristic of their being. As Fatherhood is the fundamental and distinguishing characteristic of His being, so sonship must have been the fundamental and distinguishing characteristic of theirs.\* Something like this seems to be implied in the doxology with which St. Paul opens his epistle to the Ephesians: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ; even as He chose us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blemish before Him in love; *having foreordained us unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto Himself*, according to the good pleasure of His will, to the praise of the glory of His grace, which He freely bestowed upon us in the beloved." For, however we may explain the foreordination here spoken of, it implies that before the foundation of the world the destiny of mankind, according to the Divine ideal, was that of sonship. "For whom He foreknew, He also foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son, that he might be the first born among many brethren." As the love which prompted their creation was the same fatherly love as that which from all eternity He bestowed upon the Son, they must of necessity have been foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son.

\* "The nature which determined the end was the unity which we speak of as the Godhead. In it Fatherhood and Sonship were essential and immanent, and so the end may be described as the realization of external relations correspondent to the internal; in other words, the creation of a universe which should be to God as a son, while He was to it as a Father." *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*. Fairbairn, pp. 446, 447.

This seems to be substantiated by the very form in which the creation is said to have been effected. Though the New Testament ascribes creation to the Father, it does not do so in a way implying that He is the Creator independently of the Son. On the contrary, the representation everywhere is that He created the world by or through the Son. Thus St. John says: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that hath been made." At the opening of the epistle to the Hebrews, where we are told that God "hath at the end of these days spoken to us in His Son;" we are also told that through Him "He made the worlds." \* And does not that imply that, having been thus associated in our very creation with the Son, we are destined to share not only in the love wherewith the Father loved Him, but also in that very relation which made it possible for the Son to be "the effulgence of His glory and the very image of His substance?"

Approaching, therefore, the study of our relation to God from the side of its major factor, we must affirm the divine sonship of the race. For this it was called into being. That was its end according to the divine ideal. But, if we now shift our standpoint, if we take into consideration the modification of the relation which was necessarily introduced by the free activity of man, which resulted in his Fall, can we still make this affirmation? Is God still the Father of all men? Are all men still the sons of God?

Apparently these two questions demand the same answer. If the latter is answered in the negative, it would seem as if the former ought to be; if the former is answered in the affirmative, it would seem as if the latter should be. As a matter of fact, both have been answered both affirmatively and negatively. Starting out with the proposition that by the Fall man has forfeited his right to sonship, one may very easily end with a denial of the universal Fatherhood of God; or, starting with the thought of the universal Fatherhood of God, one may just as

easily reach the conclusion that, in spite of sin, all men are still the sons of God. Let us note the method of reasoning in each case and the consequences which must follow.

Unfortunately the usual method has been to begin with the second question. When man woke to consciousness on the morning of his creation, he failed to respond to the divine love which had given him being. Repudiating the Father's love, he turned his back upon his Father's house; and, gathering together all the goods which had fallen to him, he took his journey into a far country, and there wasted his substance in riotous living. By his own act he had clearly forfeited his right to the place and privileges of a son; and hence, when he came to himself, he was ready to confess, "Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and *am no more worthy to be called thy son.*" To this confession the consciousness of mankind has borne universal testimony. Man feels his guilt; and on account of his transgression, he can find it in his heart to ask for nothing better than to be made like one of the hired servants. He failed to realize God's ideal and purpose with regard to him; he wickedly renounced his original position of sonship; he utterly wasted all his original endowments; he was stranded, a miserable bankrupt, with nothing to eat and with nowhere to go; and he found himself alone, a stranger in a strange land.

There can be no question about the correctness of this picture of man's lost condition; for it is drawn by the Master Himself. And there can be no question either about the fact that, in that condition, he had forfeited his right to the name of a son. He was an alien and a stranger. On his side the relation which God had constituted in the creation was broken; and he no longer retained the power of restoring it. Did this breaking of the filial relation, on the part of man, also break the relation on its divine side? Was the paternal relation destroyed, because the filial was broken? Many, accepting their conclusion from the seeming logical necessities of the case, have unhesitatingly answered in the affirmative. Since man renounced his sonship, God is supposed to have either renounced or else lost His Fath-



erhood. Since man wickedly wandered from home, God is supposed to have cast him off.

The consequences of this mode of reasoning have been sad enough. While it left the way open for the adoption of a certain number, to whom God might become reconciled by the death of His Son, it obscured the idea of His eternal Fatherhood in the mind of the Church, and it made Him appear as no longer capable of loving all mankind. Probably nothing else tended so strongly to foster the notion of a limited atonement, and that other fearful conception that God loved only a limited portion of the race, for whose redemption He made provision, while He passed by all the rest as reprobates.

But this method of reasoning does violence to the divine nature; and it is, moreover, in conflict with much of the teaching of the New Testament Scriptures. Man might fail to realize what was implied in the filial relation into which he was brought by the very fact of his creation; for he was finite, and he had to realize by his own will what was before him simply as a possibility. But the same can not be said of God. His Fatherhood is of the very essence of His being. It is not conditioned by anything on the outside of Himself. He can not cease to be a Father without ceasing to be God. His Fatherhood, moreover, was from the beginning perfect. His paternal love did not have need to be called into being by the creation or the activity of His children. As we saw before, it was the very motive which called them into being. It might be wounded by the disobedience of His children; but it could not cease to be, because it was infinite and eternal.

This, we believe, is the way in which the matter is presented in the New Testament. In spite of all the prodigal had done, he was not forgotten by his father. He was missed, sadly and sorely missed, but not cast off nor forgotten. When at last he returned, utterly bankrupt in life and possessions, the father saw him, when he was as yet a great way off, and he "had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck and kissed him." No; although man had sinned and repudiated God's love, God did not

cease to love man. Even when men had wandered farthest from Him, "He left not Himself without witness in that He did good, and gave you from heaven rains and fruitful seasons, filling your hearts with food and gladness." Though He showed His displeasure on account of sin in countless ways, He at the same time was continually showing forth His goodness and His love. He even gave His Son, in order that He might win men back to Himself. "For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life."

Both Scripture and reason, therefore, demand that we should reject the conclusion which denies the universal Fatherhood of God. Even in spite of sin, God continues the Father of all men. He still loves us with a Father's love, and He is willing and ready to receive the prodigal, wherever and whenever he may return. Nay, more; He runs to meet him, when he is yet a great way off; and He is still ready to fall upon his neck and to kiss him, even before he can make his confession.

But will this answer of the first question now carry us to the necessity of answering the second in the same way? In more recent years many have done so, with what at first sight seems some show of reason. Not only does it seem the logical conclusion from the universal Fatherhood of God, but some facts seem to indicate that the sinner is still the child of God. The prodigal, even at the lowest point of his wandering, still had a reminiscence of his father and of his father's house. The word, which most naturally rose to his lips, when he came to himself, was the word *father*. While he was still feeding swine in that far country, he exclaimed: "How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger! I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son; make me as one of thy hired servants." This fact, that Jesus represents the prodigal as still retaining the reminiscence of the filial consciousness, has often been overlooked; but it cannot be without significance in a parable

which sets before us so fully the Gospel in miniature. Even in all his wanderings there remained a reminiscence of his former relation. And does not the consciousness of the heathen furnish a striking parallel to what our Lord thus represents as the consciousness of the prodigal? The Greeks and Romans continued to call their chief deity, "The father of men and of gods." To this dim reminiscence of sonship, still lingering in the heathen consciousness, St. Paul appealed in his address to the Athenians on Mars Hill, saying: "In Him we live, and move and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, *For we are also his offspring.*" And so much it seems necessary to affirm, if we would have any basis on which to affirm an adoption of the sinner into the family of God; for even God cannot adopt into His family one who has never been a son, and who does not have capacity for that high spiritual communion, which the idea of sonship implies. In the words of Principal Fairbairn: "It is the veriest nominalism to speak of the adoption of a man who never was a son, for the term can denote nothing real. The legal fiction has a meaning and a use only where it represents or pretends to represent something in the world of fact; but to speak of the 'adoption' of a creature who is in no respect a son, is to use a term which is here without the saving virtue of sense."\*

To affirm, however, on such grounds that all men are still the sons of God, in the sense in which the New Testament uses that term, would be a most perilous mistake. For wherever men have allowed themselves to be carried over from the affirmation of the universal Fatherhood of God to this, its apparently logical conclusion, a most serious misconception of the entire work of redemption has followed. The New Testament constantly affirms that men become sons of God through Jesus Christ, implying that out of Him they can not lay claim to the privilege. Thus St. John says: "But as many as received Him, to them gave He the right to become children of God, even to them that believe in His name; which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." According to

\*The Place of Christ in Modern Theology, p. 446.

this not only must men *become* sons of God, but only those who believe in Jesus Christ and share in the blessing of a new birth from above can even claim the *right* of becoming sons. Our Lord brings out substantially the same thing in the Sermon on the Mount, where He says, "Love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you, *that ye may be the sons of your Father which is in Heaven*;" implying that, while God continues to be our Father in heaven, we must comply with certain conditions in order to be His sons. We must exercise the same love wherewith He loved us, even to the extent of loving our enemies; otherwise we have no claim to the right and privilege of sonship. And this is the tenor of the whole New Testament.

Our second question, therefore, we must answer by saying that all men are no longer by nature the sons of God; only those who are again restored to the privilege through the mediatorial work of our Lord. The marred image of their Father remains in them as the basis on which they may again be adopted; but they must be adopted, before they can again take their place in the family of God.

Coming back, then, once more to our twofold question, we say that the true state of the case demands this apparently paradoxical answer: "God is the Father of all men, but men *become* sons of God." \* The latter is possible, because the former continues true. Though pained by the fact that His children have despised His love, God still continues to love them; and that seeking, sorrowing love of a Father's heart becomes the basis for their restoration, just as it was the motive for their creation in the beginning.

How now shall we conceive of this adoption,† by which the

\* Doctrine and Life, Stephens, p. 75.

† *Υιοθεσία* seems to occur but five times in the New Testament, and not at all outside of St. Paul's Epistles. (Rom. 8, 15, 23; 9, 4. Gal. 4, 5; Eph. 1, 5.) Adoption is doubtless the only word that translates it; but it scarcely conveys to us the fulness of meaning, which the original conveyed to the Greek mind. We get our word from the Latin *adoptio* (*ad* + *optare*, to choose for, properly for one's self), and it still has much of the Roman legalism about it; it approaches the subject from the standpoint of what it confers and gives to

prodigal, after he has forfeited his place in the Father's house, is again received into favor? Very evidently it must be something more than a mere legal fiction, by which he is accounted a son because of what some one else has done, without himself becoming in reality all that is implied in the relation of sonship. He must be freed from all the evil effects of his wanderings and apostasies, and he must be lifted into the full realization of what was originally involved in the divine ideal of the relation; and inasmuch as the relation is both vital and moral, the adoption must include both restoration and perfect realization in both respects.

There must, first of all, be a restoration. The prodigal must be restored to the position in the Father's house, which he has willfully and wickedly left. This implies on the one side forgiveness, and on other the bestowal of a new portion in the place of that which he has squandered. As long as the consciousness of guilt remains upon his conscience, he cannot enter the home with the spirit of a son; and as long as he continues in his miserable, bankrupt condition, with his whole portion squandered and destroyed, he is not in a position in which he can again respond to the requirements of sonship. Even more than that. By his creation he was a son in possibility, but he failed to attain to the blessings of sonship, because he failed to realize what was involved in that possibility. Now that he may be a son indeed, his adoption must include such a discipline as will bring him to the realization of those possibilities; and, hence, while he may receive the Spirit of adoption from the moment he re-enters the Father's house, the adoption itself can become complete, only when he has now learned to respond in full to the Father's love. Hence, St. Paul, speaking of the whole creation groaning and

the one adopted; it is to *take and treat as a child*; and so it contains scarcely a suggestion of any change wrought in the person himself. *Υιοθεσία*, on the other hand, presents the idea from just the opposite standpoint. Compounded of *υιός*, a son, and *τιθεσθαι*, to place, or to make one something, it carries with it the idea of actually making the adopted one a son, not simply admitting him to certain privileges, but *actually making him all that the relation of sonship implies*.



travailing in pain together until now, goes on to say: "And not only so, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, *waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.*"\*

It must be evident at once that these are blessings which can be bestowed only by a Father's love. He alone can forgive the apostasies and wanderings. He alone can restore the wasted goods. He alone can provide the discipline needed, for the realization of His ideal.

These blessings He bestowed through His Son, by whom at the beginning He made the worlds. Being from all eternity the absolutely perfect realization of the divine ideal of sonship, the Son, not the Father nor the Holy Spirit, came down to restore the filial relation which had been broken by the Fall. Viewed from this standpoint, His incarnation and life have a peculiar significance. As the eternal archetype of all created sonship, He came down to earth and realized the divine ideal of humanity, first of all lifting it up into personal union with His own life, and then fully realizing the filial relation in created, human form. Emptying Himself of His glory, He took upon Himself our humanity; not, however, as it came from the hand of its Maker in the beginning, but in its ruined and lost condition, in that "far country," where, as a prodigal, the race had wasted all its original endowments in riotous living. From that place, and in that condition, He was the first one to make the weary journey homeward to the Father's house; and, in making it, He endured all the misery and pain, which the journey under such conditions implied. He had to encounter all the temptations, all the scorn, and all the persecution, which the "citizen of that country," whose service He renounced, could heap upon Him. Then followed the misery and pain, as in that weak condition, footsore

Rom. 8: 23. "*Whilst we wait for the adoption of children. It is true, believers have already this blessing (verse 15), but only as inward relation and as divine right, with which, however, the objective and real state does not yet correspond. Thus, looked at from the standpoint of complete realization, they only receive υιοθεσίαν at the Parousia, whereupon the ἀποκάλυψις τῶν υἱῶν τ. θεοῦ and their δόξα ensues.*" Meyer, Com. in loco. p. 329.

and alone, He accomplished the long journey. Mysteriously, all the ills and sorrows of our ruined state fell upon Him. He bore "our griefs and carried our sorrows." He was "stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted." He was "wounded for our transgressions," "bruised for our iniquities," and the "chastisement of our peace was upon Him." Yet poor, despised, and weary as He was, He made the journey alone, doing all the Father's will, and realizing at every point the fullness of the filial relation. Enduring all the suffering and sorrow which that journey implied, He went before us in the way we must go, if we would return to our home; "for it became Him, for whom are all things and through whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through suffering." At the darkest part of the road He might indeed pray, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me;" yet even in the midst of that terrible darkness He was ready to exclaim, "Not my will, but thine be done." Having thus, even though He was a Son, learned obedience by the things which he suffered, He conquered death and hell, having joined our humanity forever into personal union with His divinity, and having thus lifted it into the perfect realization of that divine Sonship which was His peculiar glory from all eternity.

And we now become sons of God through Him. As he raised our humanity into the perfect realization of sonship by personal union with His divine life, so are we put into the way of realizing our sonship by being raised into union with Himself through faith in Him. By a new birth from above, we share in His life, and He becomes our elder brother. In the mystery of that new birth there comes to us the forgiveness of our past transgressions; we again become members of the heavenly family; and receiving the spirit of adoption, we cry, Abba, Father. Even more than that. We become heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ; in the place of the portion which was wasted in our apostasy we receive a new inheritance; and in the strength of the gifts and graces which are therein supplied, we begin to respond to the Father's love and to do His will. Our whole life then becomes a

discipline, in which we learn more and more to realize what is implied in the ideal of our sonship; and when finally we shall have been fully delivered from all the effects of the Fall, and when we shall have realized all that is implied in the relation, then, and not until then, will we become sons, indeed, with all that the name implies, and then only will our adoption become full and complete.

#### IV.

### THE OLD TESTAMENT IN ITS RELATION TO SOCIAL REFORM.\*

BY REV. PHILIP VOLLMER, PH. D., PHILADELPHIA.

Socialism is an international movement which seeks to overthrow existing social and economic institutions, and proposes a coöperative form of production as a substitute for the existing competitive system. Socialism must not be confounded with Anarchy, which demands the total abolition of the state, the family and religion.

The "Social Question" is the absorbing topic of the day among all thinking people in Europe, especially in Germany. At the last election the Social-Democratic party polled over two millions of votes for their representatives in the German Reichstag. To arrest their growth and crush the movement, special laws have been enforced with all severity, but without perceptible success. Even the army is being saturated with their teachings. It has been supposed that their doctrines could never obtain in our own land of freedom and plenty, but we have discovered that German Socialism has been largely imported, has taken root and is having a vigorous growth even among American workmen. President Seelye, of Amherst College, says: "There are probably 100,000 men in the United States to-day whose animosity against all existing social institutions is hardly less than boundless." But the present strength of Socialistic organizations in the United States concerns us less than their *prospective* numbers. Men of thought, therefore, view the future with extreme apprehension, and a German writer said lately: "We are approaching a revolution in comparison with which the French Revolution of 1789, and the Paris Communistic uprising of 1871 were only child's play. The crisis will pass over, just as the

\* An essay to which the Bloomfield Alumni Prize was awarded.

Peasants' War of 1525 passed over, but it will be far more disastrous for both combatants."

In view of all this it is singularly strange that even Christian thinkers fail to consider the most valuable hints which the Old Testament offers for the solution of the social problem. Most men forget, if they have ever known, that the law of Moses is an almost inexhaustible treasury of social and economic wisdom. Dr. J. Strong is correct when he asserts in his excellent book, *The Message of Jesus to Men of Wealth*: "Jesus is the Saviour of society no less than of the individual souls; to disregard his teachings is poor statesmanship and bad political economy, as well as bad morals and irreligion." Many questions which threaten to shake up and tear our social fabric would not have reached their present formidable aspect if society had been a little less controlled by Roman jurisprudence and a little more by the principles of the Mosaic law. It would certainly be impracticable to transplant the law of Moses in its entirety into the constitutions of our modern Christian states, but its leading principles, its spirit, its methods and its aims, are worthy of the profoundest consideration by Christian statesmen and citizens.

The design of this paper is, therefore, to specify the principles of Socialism as it exists among the German people and elsewhere, and to bring out into clear statement the way in which the Old Testament provided a solution for the four main questions into which the so-called "Social Question" may conveniently be subdivided. In doing this, fairness requires that we state the Socialistic principles as they have been laid down in the officially adopted platform of the party, and not according to the opinions of individual leaders, much less according to the statements of their adversaries. The movement being international, the statement of principles in the "Programme" of the German Socialists will be found to be essentially the same among their adherents everywhere. Many embittered and enraged Socialists may be induced to open their hearts again to the benign influences of religion when it is shown to them that their Heavenly Father is not at all indifferent even to their material welfare, and that



3,000 years ago, among his ancient people, He provided already a solution for the evils under which they suffered.

#### •I. PROPERTY.

First in importance among the burning social questions stands the property question, *i. e.*, the war against private and the advocacy of common property. The peculiar conception of property, of wealth and their acquisition is not accidental, but fundamental to the whole Socialistic system, its very centre. In giving up the battle against private property, Socialism would give up itself. Many people have the mistaken idea that the Socialists demand an "equal division" of all property. Just the opposite of it, Communism, *i. e.*, the undivided common possession of the soil, the instruments of labor, raw material and capital, is his end and aim. One of their organs, *The People's State*, writes (1871, No. 80), "Communism is Socialism carried to its logical end." Consequently the first demand in its official "Programme" is as follows: "Emancipation of labor requires the transformation of all private property into common or public property, and an equitable division of the product of labor." And Proudhon, in his classical sentence, goes so far as to assert, "Property is theft." Thus we see that Socialism opposes the very principle of private ownership, and not simply the evils connected with it.

Each conception, the current one of individual and the Socialistic one of common property, contains one-half of the truth. The Old Testament unites the two and makes them a harmonious whole. Its leading principle touching the question of property, is found in the words, "Thus saith the Lord, the land is mine, for ye are strangers and sojourners with me." (Lev. 25: 23.) This declaration plainly shows that for the Israelite absolute possession, as we understand it, did not exist. Jehovah is the Lord of all the earth, and Canaan, too, is His. The people are "strangers and sojourners with Him," as it were, but tenants and usufructuaries of the same. Only with these restrictions, Palestine was called the property of Israel. And as such it was subdi-

vided into tribal and family property (Numb. 26: 53; 33: 54.) But not only was this division made on a basis of perfect equality; there were besides three highly important provisions against a possible accumulation of landed property on the part of a few individuals. The leading principle of the following three provisions was that no one had the power to *sell* his possessions absolutely and for all time.

1. The king has a direct and binding commandment against accumulating riches (Deut. 17: 17).

2. The "right of ransom" gave to the seller an opportunity to buy back his property at any time at selling price; indeed, it was his privilege to deduct whatever benefit had accrued to the buyer in the meantime. Even the relatives could lay claim to this privilege (Levit. 25: 24).

3. At all events, the Year of Jubilee returned to the original owner all his real estate, and the selling price was determined in accordance with the provision (Levit. 25: 14).

The great benefits of such laws are found in the fact that, though a man might be compelled by adversity to sell his property, yet he was thereby not left in hopeless poverty, while on the side of the rich an undue accumulation of real estate and capital was prevented.

By the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," which was enforced by many minor provisions of the law, this equitably divided property was protected from injury. See Ex. 24: 4; Deut. 22: 1; Gen. 43: 13; Levit. 6: 5.

This brief survey of the most vital of all social problems, the property question, brings out the sharp contrast between the spirit of the Mosaic law and the spirit of our modern conceptions of property. The latter makes man the absolute owner, while the former declares that he is but the steward of his possessions. The Mosaic law is, therefore, a bulwark against social revolution from above as well as below, and is equally removed from undue accumulation as from unnatural equalization of property. The doctrines of the Old Testament with reference to property are, therefore, not mere obsolete notions, but they contain many prac-

tical hints, and show us in what spirit God would have his people of to-day approach the solution of the social problem. For the belief in the sovereign ownership of God throws a divine sanction around the individual stewardship of man. It makes the reward of industry and fruits of toil, the house of honesty and the inheritance of virtue, the rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, sacred and inviolable. It says to the wild mob as well as to the greedy despot, to the cheating trader as well as to the bold brigand, to the crafty devisers of financial traps as well as to the furtive pickpocket, "Thou shalt not steal." Peace and order comes into society when men recognize for themselves and their fellows that all they have fairly inherited and fairly earned is their possession because God, the owner of all things, has put it into their hands, simply as a trust.

## II. POVERTY AND WEALTH.

According to the Socialistic gospel, Communism is to level the differences between poverty and wealth. A brief glance at these is, therefore, a natural sequence to the discussion of the property question.

It is an undeniable fact that the contrast between wealth and poverty is great and on the increase. The rich grow richer and the poor become poorer. It is, therefore, the duty of every philanthropist to help bridge over this yawning chasm. The modern state, especially in Europe, attends to this duty better than formerly, and tries by numerous laws (accident insurance, Sunday laws, cash salaries, laborers' saving funds, etc.,) to stem the tide of poverty. A large number of private enterprises (charities, relief associations, building societies) are working toward the same end. But Socialism looks with contempt upon all these exertions and proposes to do away with the difference between rich and poor by totally abolishing individual property and establishing joint ownership. In their "Programme" they declare: "The dependence of the working classes in modern society is the root of all misery and subjection in all its forms. We, therefore, demand a progressive income tax, the abolition of all indirect

taxes which press heaviest upon the poor, a normal work day and the prohibition of Sunday as well as of child labor."

Now let us see what directions God has given to mitigate the great contrast between the rich and the poor. In so doing we shall find that all laws for the protection of the poor are based on the principle that *every Israelite must at least have the necessities of life*. In detail we find the following laws:

1. In the "Sabbath Year" the stranger, the hired servant, the widows and orphans are to have their part of all that grows alone (Levit 25: 3-7).

2. Besides the Levites, the stranger, the widows and orphans are to have one-tenth of the income every three years (Deut. 26: 12).

3. During the harvest, whatever grew on the border of the field, also the leavings, also the forgotten sheaf, belonged to the poor (Levit. 19: 9; Deut. 24: 19).

4. By special command of Jehovah, it was the right of the poor to take part in the feast at the offering of the first fruits, and at the high festivals of sacrifice. Strangers, widows and orphans were included in this (Deut. 16: 10). Our Lord Jesus repeats this command in Luke 14: 12, and St. Paul impresses it upon the Church in 1 Cor. 10: 13.

5. A very peculiar law, entirely unique in its way, is that forbidding the taking of all kinds of interest among Israelites. An Israelite is to regard the lending of money as a gift of love, not as a money-making transaction (Deut. 23: 19).

6. The debtor was allowed to select himself the forfeit and carry it to his creditor, and the latter had no right to enter the debtor's house and take from him the necessary implements as security (Ex. 22: 26).

7. Moreover, the law takes pleasure in speaking of the poor as peculiarly an object of God's care, and often calls him "thy brother or neighbor who is in poverty" (Ex. 22: 23).

As the Year of Jubilee is sure to put an end to all poverty, because every one comes into possession of his ancestral property, therefore all these rules have the one object, to prevent the ex-

istence of a pauper class or proletariat. No abject poverty, no pauperism, no death from actual want of a piece of bread, while certain rich men are clothed in purple and fine linen, faring sumptuously every day! This has been the will of God 3,000 years ago; this is the will of God to-day. And when the spirit, not the letter, of these old poor laws will guide the modern legislator, then the day of the solution of this social question is dawning.

### III. CLASS DISTINCTIONS.

Socialism says: When everything belongs to everybody, there will not only be no poverty but also no difference in rank. With plutocracy, aristocracy also will fall. A discussion of this point, therefore, follows naturally the two preceding ones. It is an axiom of Socialism that different classes among society cannot live in peace with each other. Everything that increases the intensity of the battle of the masses against the classes is, therefore, heartily welcome, especially the strikes. The *Social Democrat* (1872, 40) writes: "As long as there are different ranks and classes among men, just so long will philanthropy remain unresurrected. Socialism believes philanthropy to be possible only where there is perfect equality. As long as there are privileged classes, high or low, hatred seems to have a natural sway." Consequently the declaration of the "Programme" is: "We strive for the abolition of all social and political inequality, of all exceptional laws, and equal education for all."

What Socialism strives for, Israel possessed. Unlike all European nations, Israel knows no difference in rank. No artificial barrier destroys social equality in her precincts. The underlying thought and principle for this condition we find in Levit. 25: 55: "For unto Me the children of Israel are servants; they are my servants whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt." The hundreds of thousands are thus brought, by this declaration, into one class, whose central power thrones high above them, to be sure, but which nevertheless lives in their midst and desires to raise them to His serene height. The social foundation of the whole structure is unity, but not in the sense of uniformity. The people of



Israel formed an organism of many members. Princes stood at the head of the twelve tribes; elders rule the families; the house father is the head of the household. A senate of seventy elders holds the highest power. Questions of particular importance to the community were settled at specially called gatherings of the people. We have here the sketch of a representative form of government, which in principle is fully up to our modern constitutions. But beyond these natural divisions there were no differences in rank. The king, as well as the High Priest, could choose a wife from any family. Every Israelite paid the same tax from his twentieth year up, and (Ex. 30: 13) expressly commands: "The rich shall not give more and the poor not less than the half shekel," and as this poll-tax expresses man's relation to Jehovah, this law means to show that socially and politically there is no difference between individuals. Wealth does not insure privileged social standing; on the contrary, Jehovah repeatedly calls Himself the friend of the poor. Even the tribe of Levi is to receive the tenth not as a privilege of rank, but to make up for the fact that they received no tribal possessions.

No classes, no hierarchy, no proletariat, no social privileges—this is the happy condition of this people! Much hollow pride on the one hand, and much slavish subjection on the other, is thus nipped in the bud. The social problem, which like a lurid sunset seems to prophecy a stormy future, was settled for Israel long ago. Fortunate people! That which modern civilization prizes as her highest attainment, which has cost and will cost streams of blood to flow, that was yours fully three thousand years past; not by humanly invented theories, but through the law of Jehovah.

#### IV. LABOR AND THE LABORER.

Even in the dominion of Socialism man must work, communism and equality in rank notwithstanding. The circle of the four social questions thus closes fitly with the examination, how the work should be done according to Socialistic ideas and how according to the law of Moses.

Very explicit is here again the declaration of the "Pro-

gramme:" "Labor is the source of all wealth, and as labor for the common welfare is alone possible through society, therefore society should have the common benefit of, and at the same time be under obligations to participate in labor. We, therefore, demand the abolition of the iron wage system, the extermination of extortion in every form, the prohibition of Sunday labor, child labor and all male labor detrimental to health or morals; laws protecting the life and health of the laborer, sanitary supervision of factories and workmen's homes, regulation of prison work."

The relation of the Old Testament to labor reform is manifold. First of all it ennobles labor by the commandment to our first parents "to till the ground," that is, to work. Among the Greeks, the Romans and the old Teutons labor was considered dishonoring for the free man; slaves and women were supposed to labor. Then, in the Fourth Commandment, not only rest on the seventh day, but also work on the six other days, is directly commanded. The law sees, therefore, in every member of God's people a laborer. Strictly speaking, it does not acknowledge a social difference between employer and employee at all; capital is not to become a power over labor. All Israelites are servants of Jehovah, each one placed by him in his appointed place of labor, be it mental or manual. A life of pure enjoyment, intellectual or material, has no inherent worth or value. Idleness, though it be decked in purple and fine linen, is sin in itself.

This routine of daily duties is relieved by the second part of the commandment, to rest upon the seventh day—master, servant, children, animals—all. With this command God has established an institution which is becoming more and more appreciated even by modern science, as a necessity for man and well ordered society. And it is a matter of no little importance that the Socialists in their "Programme" demand prohibition of Sunday labor, and in the German Reichstag voted unanimously in favor of more stringent Sunday laws.

The law of Moses distinguishes between three kinds of laborers. The first of these was the *day laborer*. So that his freedom may not be interfered with, Deut. 24:14 provides that his

wages are to be paid each evening. The second class, the *servants*, are bound to the master's house, though only for a few years. In the seventh year, but certainly in the Year of Jubilee, they were free. "And then," says the law, "thou shalt not let them go empty-handed" (Deut. 15: 12-15). A just and gentle conduct toward his servant is impressed upon the master (Levit. 25: 43). In spiritual things, Sabbath rest and feast days, these servants were to be treated like the free. His murder was punished by the death of the murderer; cruel treatment secured his freedom immediately (Ex. 21: 20). The third class, the *serfs*, was not to be entered by the Israelite except of his own free will (Levit. 25: 39). But a Jewish servant could become a serf, in case he did not desire to take advantage of the seventh year which set him free (Deut. 15: 16). The children of a servant to whom his master gave one of his maid-servants as his wife also belonged to the class of serfs. This kind of service seems to throw a dark shadow upon the bright picture of the social order depicted in the Old Testament. No doubt it does not come up to the ideal. But as in America, so in Israel, there was a constant battle of the ideal against human hard-heartedness, and so God permitted, "for their hardness of heart," an institution of which he did not approve. But with special emphasis the law impressed upon the masters tender consideration, mild treatment and humanity, so that in reality serfdom was little more than a name. And even that we do not find in the Old Testament.

These Israelitish laborers were in more than one sense in a better condition, freer from care, in many respects more protected and independent than to-day thousands of laborers who sigh under the burden of our present social conditions.

---

The above four points form the quintessence of the "social question" in all lands. Other points might be mentioned, but they are either of minor importance, or simply practical applications of those principles, or opinions of individual leaders for

which the movement as such cannot with fairness be held responsible, as, for instance, free love, common education of the children, antagonism against all religion, etc.

The celebrated economist Leroy says: "In all things we are brought back to the same conclusions, that there is nothing truly efficacious, nothing solid and lasting for society outside of the Gospel, outside of the Christian spirit and outside of Christian fraternity." The ethical and social value of the New Testament is to-day almost universally conceded. But our present investigation has shown that also the Old Testament already contains laws, provisions and regulations which, though they are not to be slavishly imitated nor bodily transplanted into our modern soil, will, as to their spirit and principles, serve as a faithful guide for all who are working at the solution of the social problem. And social reformers should, therefore, always heed the advice given to Joshua. "This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein; for then thou shalt make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success" (Josh. 1: 8).

## V.

### HIGHER CRITICISM.

BY REV. ELLIS N. KREMER, D. D.

Higher criticism is the application to the study of the Bible of the same rules and principles which obtain in the criticism of any work of literature. It is, in brief, literary criticism.

Dr. Willis K. Beecher defines Higher Criticism as, "of course, the scientific search after the truth in regard to the literary structure and peculiarities and authorship of writings."

When this is applied to the Bible it is a line of work which is worthy of earnest and prayerful attention. It demands, however, not only learning and a sound judgment, but a reverent and believing attitude towards the Bible.

The objection to Higher Criticism lies in the implication that it is the test of the Scriptures. This does not follow. It is evident that the Scriptures furnish the essential principle without which all criticism is valueless, viz., truth. Christ as the truth, and the Bible, as the revelation of Christ, become the test of criticism.

Criticism may be true both as to method and results, but false as to deductions.

*e. g.* Should criticism find in the Books of Moses words and phrases, or portions of the writings which indicate the hand of more than one writer, and intervals of time between the composition of different portions of the work, it does not follow that Moses is not the author of the whole. For it is a well-known principle, illustrated in the writings of every author, that the works of the past are the inheritance of the present.

Higher criticism has been used so largely for destructive criticism that it is difficult to overcome a prejudice against the term. Many causes may exist for this prejudice. We instance two.

I. The reverence with which we regard the Word of God is shocked when confronted by criticism of its structure or any part



of its contents. We may recognize our obligation to the critic for clearer light thrown on some passages, and for the removal of difficulties which we have reverently and quietly endured as beyond our understanding. Yet we inwardly rebel against the term.

The word criticism suggests to many minds opposition to the object criticised, unfavorable criticism, rather than careful examination of it. From this view we need to be delivered.

II. The higher critics themselves are largely responsible for this prejudice. Many of them are destructive as to their methods and purpose. They hang weighty conclusions against the truth of the Scriptures on the most insignificant pegs of alleged contradictions in the record. They manifest a purpose to break down rather than to build up the faith of believers. They use old and worn-out arguments clothed in modern verbiage and parade them as new. They ignore or slightly notice pertinent objections to their own reasoning. They assume certain things to be true, argue from them as if they have been proven, and assert their conclusions to be facts when they are no more than assumptions. Some of them add to this a professed veneration for the Bible as containing, in some form and somewhere, the revelation of God, while others class it with the sacred myths and religious books of heathen religions. These men call themselves the genuine higher critics; they rejoice in the name; they boast of their freedom from traditionalism. They arrogate to themselves the knowledge requisite to the proper estimate of the text and construction of the Bible, and class as unlearned those who have not waded through all the nonsense written by generations of their kind. They do not see that right principles are as necessary for the criticism of the text as a collection of facts; that many of their alleged facts are not proven; that even if they were proven the deductions which they make from them are not necessary consequents.\* These two causes have tended to create and foster a prejudice against the term Higher Criticism until some have become foolishly afraid of it, and others fail to see the

\*See a condensation of Dr. Josef Ritter's critical work, for a recent illustration of the methods of destructive critics. *Lit. Digest*, Jan. 18, 1896.

service which has been rendered to the cause of truth by the patient labors and superior scholarship devoted to the examination of the Bible.

The fact that higher critics of the reverent and believing order are compelled to define their position against those of a destructive tendency or purpose shows that the term is an unfortunate one. It is a definition which needs defining.

It is difficult to see, however, how the use of it could be avoided. It is to be regretted that the name has been made the occasion for the persecution and harsh condemnation of good men, whose chief offence seems to have been their scholarship and the fact that they are higher critics.

Coming back to Dr. Beecher's definition, and substituting the word Bible for writings, the question arises: Is such criticism legitimate?

Before taking up the question some words with regard to the Bible are necessary.

The church in the beginning could exist without Scriptures. The necessity for it was superseded by reason of the long lives of the generations of believers from Adam to Abraham. Adam to Lameck, Lameck to Shem, Shem to Abraham, is the line through whom it was possible to transmit the promises revealed by God. There is much reason to believe, however, that Scriptures existed before those of Moses. It is rational to suppose that men of active minds and deep religious faith and hope should commit the heavenly promise to writing. That the Holy Spirit should so move them is in harmony with our knowledge of His activity. Further, there are in the judgment of scholars indications in the Bible itself which amount almost to positive evidence of the existence of such documents. In the work assigned him by the Holy Spirit, Moses may have used such writings, even as his own writings were undoubtedly used by inspired men who wrote after his death.

The Christian Church existed for some time without the New Testament. There were living witnesses able to declare the wonderful works of God.

As Scriptures became a necessity for the continued existence and growth of the Old Testament Church, so did they for the New. God did not leave Himself without witnesses. He has given this witness, to accord with the peculiar nature and needs of humanity, in writings, the safest and most satisfactory way for its communication and preservation. That the Bible has been able to sustain the attacks against it is a sure testimony to the wisdom and goodness of God in making known and transmitting His revelation by means of it. Traditions, or even monuments of stone or brass, could never have stood the test of ages as the Bible has done, without the intervention of a perpetual miracle for their protection.

As Jesus said of the Sabbath we can say of the Bible, "It was made for man." Its preservation is assured to us not only on the ground of its truth and divine origin, but because man needs it.

The Bible is "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." For these purposes it is to be used. If the emphasis be placed on "profitable" it will come forth from every assault with flying colors. For wherever its precepts have been heeded it has exalted the life of the nation in righteousness.

The Bible is not a work on science, general or particular. It is a revelation. It is more than a record of revelation, for it contains the words of God which are said to be, "spirit and life." As the setting is necessary for the usefulness and beauty of the diamond, so the Bible contains much in the form of human language and arrangement which is necessary to set forth the words of God. But the latter glorifies the former, so that the whole work is properly called the Word of God, even as the diamond gives its name to the stone and to the setting which holds the stone.

The Bible stands alone among all the books of the ages because of its truth, its wisdom, its beauty, its righteousness; its lessons for the regulation of our earthly life, civil, social, domestic and personal, and of our life with regard to God; its power to console, to inspire and to guide; its exposure of the inborn sin-

fulness of the race and its promise of the rest and peace of the Heavenly Kingdom; its revelation of man's origin and yet more glorious destiny. But the great significance and worth of the Bible lies in the fact that it bears witness to our Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, the Revealer of the Father, the Saviour of men.

This, at least, is what St. John claims for his Gospel; what the Saviour claims for the Old Testament, and presumably, therefore, what the whole Bible is.

All that can be said of it in other respects can be said of it because of this fact, that it testifies of Christ. It cannot be substituted for Christ. But in pointing to Him, and leading men to believe in Him and to follow Him, it accomplishes its most important work.

For this reason the man who believes the earth is square because the Bible speaks of "the four corners of the earth," but who has received its testimony to Jesus and has accepted Him with a penitent and believing heart, knows more of the real power of the Bible than the most gifted scholar who reads and studies the Hebrew text and the ancient versions, but who rejects the Redeemer whom it proclaims. He knows more also of its contents. He has learned and experienced its deepest truth, its most glorious fact.

To assert this is not to set a premium on ignorance. The Bible is not a geography, but the setter-forth of mysteries which appeal to faith.

Whatever difficulties are encountered by the student of the Bible, he will yet find it impossible to account for its existence without accepting the direct agency of God in its formation. It calls for a greater stretch of belief to ascribe the book to uninspired men, or to account for it on the theory of the evolution of purely human religious purposes and hopes, than it does of faith to receive it as the word of God.

St. Paul says, "all Scripture is given by inspiration." St. Peter says, "Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" and "the spirit that was in them testified" of

Christ; the Epistle to the Hebrews says, "God spake in times past unto the Fathers by the prophets." The prophets themselves often prefaced their utterances by "Thus saith the Lord." They believed and accepted the Scriptures as the rule of faith and practice because they were given under the inspiration of God and expressed His will. Our Saviour said, "They cannot be broken," and "they testify of me."

The Bible is, therefore, divine. But it is not only divine; it is divine-human. The human element which contributed to the formation and preservation of the Bible is liable to err. Therefore, unless God guarded His servants against every form of error, we must expect to find some imperfections in the sacred record. We know that He did not so guard them against sin. They were holy men, but the Bible testifies to their human frailty.

As to the purpose which God had in view when He gave the Scriptures, He did preserve His servants against error; as to minor things it is rational to suppose that He left them largely to their own wisdom and accuracy. That He did so is evident from the Scriptures themselves.

The Biblical idea of inspiration is expressed in the prayer, "O Lord, open Thou my lips; and my mouth shall show forth Thy praise." Holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Their individuality was not lost, as is evident from the words they spoke; they rise above the level of uninspired men, but reach not the heights of divine accuracy. Sometimes, it is true, the Holy Ghost speaks through them, so that we have the very words of God, though ordinarily they themselves spake in in their own language under the impelling power of the Divine presence within them.

The idea that God overruled His servants and made them so respond to His spirit that every word of the Bible is exactly what God himself would have said and written had the Scriptures come from His own hand, is not an original Christian view of inspiration. It comes from a Jewish source after the Old Testament canon was closed, and was promulgated to arrest, if possible, the



decay of Jewish faith. Its acceptance by Christian teachers has thrown a burden of defense upon the Church, which God did not intend and which the truth of His Word does not demand. "The words of the wise are as goads and as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies, which are given by one Shepherd." The fact that the Scriptures come from the one Shepherd secures to us their unity as to purpose; the many masters are the source of their beautiful variety as to literary contents. The one Shepherd has given us the infallible promises and truth of the Word; the many masters are the cause of the slight inaccuracies that are found therein.

The question arises: If there are mistakes in the Bible, how shall we know what to believe and what not to believe? We answer:

1. Inaccuracies as to minor details are not necessarily mistakes, for what we may know to be inaccuracies may not have been so to the writers, nor to the age in which they lived. The sands and heat of the great desert make a waste place on the face of the earth, contrasting unfavorably with the blooming vegetation of fertile land; and yet we can look upon the earth as a whole and with full hearts exclaim: "Thou hast done all things well!"

2. It is not so important *what* we believe, where faith is an act of storing the memory with facts or the acquisition of knowledge, as *how* we believe, where it is an act of surrender to and trust in the true object of faith, Jesus Christ.

3. True faith is wrought within us by Almighty God by means of His Word and Spirit. It makes no difference to the believer whether Abraham bought a burial place of the sons of Emmor, as Stephen tells us, or of Ephron, as Moses informs us; whether Christ cured two blind men in Jericho, or only one; whether the genealogical tables of Luke and Matthew can be reconciled or not. For while such facts are profitable for instruction, they are not the object of our faith. When God presents to us His Son in His Word, and we accept Him with a believing heart, we have the true contents of Scripture, whether we have received the

word from a perfect copy of the Bible or an imperfect one, from the original or from a translation, from the old version or from the new, from the Bible or from the preacher.

If we reject Him the most accurate version will be of no use to us as regards its primal purpose.

Faith is not adherence to a certain view of truth compelled by an external force (as the weight of authority), appealing to reason, or a threat, appealing to fear, or the parental wish, appealing to affection. All these elements may be recognized in faith; first stages, as it were, leading ever to something final and complete. Ultimately faith is an inward conviction and trust in Almighty God revealed in Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son, our Saviour. From this central object of faith radiate, as the rays of light from the sun, the other great facts of revelation with which is bound up our proper apprehension of the glory and kingdom of God and the salvation of the soul. When one believes it is an acknowledgment and inward conviction of the truth of the Bible, which no criticism can break, and which, even if staggered for a time by the necessity of giving up some things which we once thought to be true, will only learn to lean more fully and positively on the true substance of the Word, Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Saviour of men.

4. There is such a thing, we say it reverently, as laying too much stress on the accuracy of the Bible, as when it is so exalted as to make Jesus the Lord stand or fall with it. He is the strength and support of His word, and it is "spirit and life," because it is the mirror of His own unspeakable glory reflecting His brightness into the heart of the believers.

It is the foolish dream of the critic that by getting rid of the fourth Gospel he can get rid of the Divinity of Jesus Christ; as if the Divinity of Christ were a doctrine, apprehended by the mind, and dependent for its truth upon the authenticity of the Gospel by St. John. It is Christ, the Godman, who makes the fourth Gospel, and in fact the whole Bible, what it is. He lies back of the Word, in no sense dependent upon it, but irradiating with His presence the whole revelation of God, as this is given to

us in the Old and New Testament, first in the way of prophecy and promise and then in actual fulfillment.

To make Christ dependent upon the Bible, rather than the Bible dependent upon Him, may be an apparent exaltation of the Word of God; but it is in fact a playing into the hands of those doctors of criticism who are ever engaged by new methods, but with the same old spirit of Anti-Christ, in an endeavor to overthrow the Divine-human Redeemer whom the Scriptures reveal, by dissecting and disjoining the sacred text, and articulating it into the skeleton of an altogether different Being.

Our apprehension of the Lord, like that of Nathaniel, who exclaimed: "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the Prince of Israel;" or the once doubting Thomas, who cried: "My Lord and my God," must be by faith in Him. When we have this faith, wrought within us by the Divine Spirit and the Scriptures, which "are able to make us wise unto Salvation," too much emphasis cannot be laid upon the Bible. We shall then have received it on that side of our life to which it appeals, the spiritual side, and to the critic who declares "this" or "that" in the Scriptures cannot be true, we can answer in all humility, but with unwavering fortitude, whether this or that be true I know not, one thing I know, whereas I was blind now I see.

A careful reading of the Bible will compel us to admit that the sacred writers were left in a large measure to their own knowledge and ability, as may be seen from different accounts, given by different writers, of the same event.

The Bible is given to us as a whole, and speaking of it we say it is an inspired Book. But it contains the reasoning of wicked men, and the record of their sinful actions, with which the sacred writers do not agree and against which they protested. In making their record and in denouncing crime the prophets and scribes were not bound to a set form, as can be seen from the various accounts of the murder of John the Baptist. Facts and their results were the needful things, the particulars, while helpful and profitable, were not necessary. When the record was thus made up, it was the church which accepted the Scriptures which we now have, and rejected others.

There was no miraculous mark put by the Hand of God upon each book to guide as to what was inspired and what was not inspired, but the Church was left, in the work of selection, to the direction and counsel of the same Spirit who guided the writers of old in the work of composition.

We need the influence of the same Spirit to properly discriminate between the revelation of God and the fallible teachings of men.

In the address of Stephen (Acts vii.) are several statements which contradict the old testament (ver. 4, 6, 16). These contradictions do not weigh against the inspiration of St. Luke. They might be regarded as holding against that of Stephen, but they are not sufficient to prove that he was not inspired. They are rather guides as to the degree and manner of inspiration. The fact that St. Luke records them argues in favor of the truthfulness of the record. Had he suppressed them, or corrected them so as to agree with the Old Testament, it might be suspected that he wrote for a purpose of his own rather than under the inspiration of God. But there they stand calmly confronting the critic, like the Sphinx of Egypt, inviting his scrutiny, but reflecting in no degree upon the hand that put them there.

Some explanation as to inaccuracies in the Bible are necessary for the child no less than for the learned scholar. Taught to believe that every word of the Bible is as God had given it, he wonders at the different accounts of the most familiar incidents. Peter's denial and the statement of three evangelists that "before the cock crow thou shalt deny me thrice," while St. Mark says "before the cock crow twice," is a case in point. The inquisitive child sees the contradiction and wants an explanation, often suffering from serious doubt in the silence of his own mind before he asks it. He may come by such questioning to lose the sense of the contradiction in the greater fact of the Saviour's compassion and learn from Peter's weakness the obvious lesson, "he that trusteth in his own heart is a fool."

But the explanation, whether wrought out by himself or given by another, leads him to see that the sacred writers wrote as they

thought. It is plain, from such discrepancies found in the Bible, that the Holy Spirit left His servants to their own knowledge and methods as regards the record of unimportant details, or the hand of the copyist is responsible for the superficial mistake. That the first explanation is the correct one is evident from the free way in which the sacred writers quote from the Old Testament, from their use of idioms, and expressions perfectly understood at the time, but to us inaccurate (as after three days he shall rise again), and from their use of such documents as they had at hand, as the genealogical tables (Matt., Luke 1 and 3).

Some of these disagreements are at present inexplicable, and must be held in the spirit of reverent and humble submission. But the testimony of the Bible to Jesus Christ is one consistent, harmonious and unbroken testimony. It has successfully resisted the persistent and continuous assault of unbelief and criticism, and is as strong to-day as when it was first spoken.

That the Bible commands reverent and adoring faith in the Lord Jesus Christ from the unlearned and learned is a higher tribute to its truth and inspiration than is all the praise we can give it. It is ever its own best defence.

Another human element which must be considered with regard to the preservation of the Bible is the copyist, in our day the printer. Are we to suppose that God so watched over the men who copied the Scriptures, and those who reproduced them in book form, as to guard them against all errors? Certainly not. There have been too many translations and revisions to admit such a thought.

Could we possess the one original authentic copy of each book of the Bible we might have a perfect book. But this is not possible, nor is it desirable. There may be seen already a tendency to Bibliolatry, and with such a Bible it is more than probable that many persons would worship it more than Christ and fix their faith on the book instead of on its Author. When Israel forgot God He allowed the ark to fall into the hands of its enemies.

From what has been said, it is evident that there is legitimate



room for Higher Criticism. Properly conducted it will result in the vindication of the Bible.

A physician, commenting on the cure of the demoniac immediately after the transfiguration, gave it as his opinion that the description of the possessed man was so full, so minute and so accurate that it could not have been fabricated, especially by a layman. The same gentleman speaking of the text, "the parents eat sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge," said: "There is a physical truth in the words which would escape the eye of the uninformed." This is one form of Higher Criticism, the application of science to the explanation of the text.

The language of the Scriptures, customs mentioned, historical statements, references to the heavens, earth, sea, winds and lightning, to instruments of music, weapons, etc., are proper objects of critical study.

Such study assists in fixing the time when and circumstances under which the parts of Scripture have been composed. In the 19th Psalm the natural kingdom and the revealed word are presented as witnesses to the glory of the Lord. The one does not contradict the other. We cannot expect a complete account of the creation in the Bible, but we may learn much of it there. So also from nature we may learn much which throws light on the Bible. In the fourth command we have what is solemnly stated to be the very words of God: "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is." On its face it limits the work of creation to six days of twenty-four hours each. But in the first chapter of Genesis we read that the earth did not enjoy such a day as we have now, ruled by the sun by day and by the moon and the stars by night, until the fourth day. In the second chapter we find the word day applied to the whole period of creation. In the New Testament we read: "One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." In the geological record we read that vast periods of time elapsed between the beginning of creation and the completion of the earth as a fit abode for man. The Jews and the Apostles may have thought that the world was made in six natural days. Many

Christians think so now. But the more intelligent Christian public never think or teach any such thing. Nor do they stumble at the words of the fourth commandment. But the removal of this difficulty is due to what is now called "Higher Criticism;" the careful study of the words of the Bible, and the study of its statements in the light of science. The story of creation instead of being used, as it once was, as an argument against the inspiration and the truth of the Bible, now elicits the wonder and praise of scientific believers and unbelievers alike, because of its marvelous conformity to the geological record as it has been demonstrated by careful observers. Among all the books and traditions of the remote past, none are so true to nature and the story of the rocks as the Bible.

The process was a painful one to the consciences of some Christians; it was heartlessly applied by skeptics in attempts to destroy the foundations of faith; but it has resulted favorably to both faith and reason. We have learned to know that criticism is not necessarily a search after mistakes, but a search for truth. If in such search we run against real or apparent mistakes we have no reason to quarrel with the process.

It is but reasonable to suppose that some such searching is implied in the words of Jesus, "Ye search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me." The fearless manner in which the Apostles used the Old Testament, overthrowing the pet theories of the schools, and making everything in history, promise and worship point to Christ, teaches us the need of ever keeping in mind the purpose of the Bible, but also encourages us in its fearless examination. We subject sacred books of other religions to the test of criticism, and we must be ready to submit our own to the same test.

We can do so with the firm confidence that the "Spirit and Life" of the Word will touch and heal the humble searcher for truth, while it may be the savor of death unto death to him who approaches it with an unready mind.

That the Word of God needs to be accompanied with the explanations of learned men, suited to the age in which they live,

is evident from the Bible itself. Such explanations are frequently inserted in the record: "The Passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh;" "for the Jews, except they wash, eat not;" "though Jesus himself baptized not;" &c.

No one, we presume, would suppose that the Holy Spirit dictated these explanations.

Whether they were inserted by the original writer for the benefit of Gentile Christians, or added by a later copyist, as the marginal references have been added in some editions of the Bible, is difficult to determine. They show the free activity of the mind, and are certainly profitable for instruction, whatever may have been the cause of their presence in the sacred record. They do not weigh against the inspiration of the Scriptures, but are guides to show us how God's servants were inspired. The Spirit dwelt within them, guided them, taught them the truth, took of Christ's and showed it unto them. But He left them free.\*

In such cases as the Mosaic blessing, the very Holy of Holies of the Pentateuch, in passages of Isaiah where, as Dr. Stierr† so forcibly shows, the speaker and the one spoken of are both one, the I AM, the Jehovah, the Eternal Word, and in other portions of the Bible, the sacred writers were so moved by the Holy Spirit as to know and record the very words of God.

In the main this Divine power was the indwelling presence, the still small voice which Elijah felt. In other cases, as with Abraham, Moses and Samuel, it was the clear utterance of the Divine voice in spoken language, addressed to the ear as well as to the spirit and faith of God's servants.

While there is legitimate room for the reverent criticism of the

\*It is painful to notice that good and reverent men, controlled by a mistaken view of inspiration, have been found to object to such helps in the Scriptures as marginal references, analyses of the chapters, explanatory foot-notes, and in fact anything except the bare word itself. They think in this way to protect the integrity of the Bible, forgetting, that the very copies they print and use have been improved by explanations in the original manuscript, and by chapters, verses and punctuation marks in the printed editions.

†Words of Jesus.

Bible, and in such work the same principles can be applied as are used in other literary criticism, a further consideration of the Bible will show that such criticism is not only legitimate but necessary.

The following, among other human elements, are found in the Bible. History, description of localities, homes, manners, customs and allusions thereto; conversations, addresses, arguments; parables and allegories; statements of uninspired men and Satan; human experiences; matters of interest to the individual alone (as Paul's request with regard to his cloak, and his directions to Timothy as to the use of wine); popular superstitions (as the troubling of the pool at Bethsaida by an angel, and the inquiry of the disciples as to the man born blind); variations of language from the time of Moses to that of Malachi; styles of composition, poetical, prophetic, historical etc.; words foreign to the language of the text; references to obsolete customs.

It can be seen at once that with such a field of inquiry presented to the student he is bound to inquire because he is a student; and that such inquiry is necessary that the present age may understand the teaching of the past.

The claim which the Bible makes for itself, and which is made for it by Christians, calls for such inquiry. Such books as "Sinai and Zion," by one of our own pastors," and "The Land and the Book," have thrown light upon the Word. Why should not literary criticism conducted in the same reverent way do the same service?

It is a tribute to the worth of the Bible that the best scholarship has been enlisted in the critical study of its text, either for its overthrow or for its vindication.

In what manner should such criticism proceed?

1. A just and fair criticism can be expected only from one who is a firm believer in Christ, and who carries to his work a reverence for the Word of God and a desire to know and do its truth. Precisely the opposite of this is the case with many higher critics.

The claim made by some persons that they carry to the examination of the Bible an unbiased mind and criticize it as they

would any other book, allowing themselves to be determined by the facts discovered whether they be for or against the Bible, is preposterous. Unbelieving critics cannot do it. The Christian critic cannot, or at least ought not. If he does not have a strong and well defined bias in favor of the Word of God he has used it with very little profit to himself and others. This bias will hold his decision in abeyance when he runs against a difficulty in the text, and a seeming contradiction will receive from him the most careful attention.

Unbelievers and halting Christians may, as the result of their studies, give us important facts which may alter our view of certain portions of Scripture, but the believer alone can estimate such facts at their true worth and make them do justice to the Bible.

Many things in the Bible, since they can be analyzed and sorted by the human reason, are proper objects of criticism

But the substantial contents of the Bible, that which make it The Book, appeal to faith. They belong to the realm of mystery, and are therefore beyond criticism.

An object which cannot be defined cannot be criticised. Criticism is analysis, and it can reach only so far as the object can be analyzed.

The "Scientific search for truth in regard to the literary structure, peculiarities and authorship" of the Bible can be applied, so far as the unbelieving critic is concerned, only to the human element of the Bible. The revelation of God in Christ, salvation from sin, the future life, etc., cannot be defined by science, and therefore by it cannot be overthrown nor established. They may be rejected. But the critic is then in the position of attempting to disprove by reason that which he has simply set aside. He may object to the Bible for having such contents, but the contents themselves are beyond his reach.

And yet it is these contents which make the Bible the object of his criticism. His effort is to prove the human element of the Scriptures to be at fault, in order to disprove the Divine. He reasons from errors discovered in the text that the Bible is not what it claims to be, and, therefore, the revelation of God, the



offer of salvation, etc., are not genuine. But he has no way to prove that such a revelation and such promises could not be made nor accepted. He is confronted with the fact that, if made at all, they have been given in the Bible or else have been totally lost to the race.

It is here that the believing critic parts from the unbeliever. He knows that which he has believed. He finds the glory of the Bible to be that it reveals to faith what otherwise could not be known. And he finds that the Bible, which presents mysteries as objects of faith, is consistent with itself throughout.

2. The purpose of the Scripture should be kept in view. "These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have life through His name."

To attempt the criticism of the Bible with an eye blind to the significance of Christ, or with the purpose of reflecting upon the perfection of His being, is sure to result in deception, however, many facts may be arrayed for the purpose. Facts are not necessarily truths, nor are they always used in the service of truth.

3. It follows from the above that due account must also be made of the testimony of Christ in favor of the Old Testament. Destructive criticism reasons from errors alleged in the Old Testament to the overthrow of Christ's veracity or competency as a witness. True criticism argues from the testimony of Christ to the authenticity and truth of the Old Testament. The first by destroying the Old Testament leaves us without a Saviour; the second by accepting Christ vindicates the Old Testament.

The frequent allusions and references made by our Saviour to the Old Testament shows that His acceptance of them was full and unreserved, and His testimony voluntary and purposed.

4. Probabilities and the united testimony of scholars, when they bear against the Bible, should not be received at once as facts. Too much credit has been given by Christian critics to the "weight of authority." The facts, or alleged facts, cited against the authorship of certain books may have many sup-

porters. These, however, may be, as they have been, "sheep following their leader;" in a few months or years the weight of authority may be on the other side.

Dr. McClintock, of Dublin, chose as the motto of his medical labors, "Observe carefully, infer cautiously." Criticism of the Bible should be slow, reverent and tentative.

What estimate is to be placed on Higher Criticism? Much in the way of stimulating our investigations; little or nothing in the way of fear.

The ministry, the church, the sacraments and the Bible shall stand as witnesses of Christ until He come, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth.

There are other reasons why the critics are not to be feared. They are continually at war among themselves. Like the Pharisees, Sadducees and Herodians they may unite against Christ, but left to themselves they will cut each others' throats. Pusey (on Daniel) shows them to be bold and presumptuous, forcing truth to the support of their own fancies.

Delitzsch says: "What a motley mixture of hypotheses recent criticism of Psalms 42, 43 spreads out before us." He shows that Vaihinger, Ewald, Hitzig, Cornill (Reuss agreeing with the latter) are positive and sure of the author, and the time and circumstances of the composition of the Psalms. But each one differs from all the rest, while Maurer takes another and a negative view. He adds: "*Quærendo elegantissimi carminis Scriptorum frustra se fatigant interpretes.*" We call to mind the feats of literary criticism with regard to Junius and the poems of Ossian. Bold and positive in assertion, but in results unsuccessful and vain.

The labors of such critics, however, are not to be despised, nor is criticism to be undervalued. This is a critical age; commerce, industries, politics, government, art, literature and science do not move on in well-worn ruts, but their objects, methods and claims are critically analyzed. In no department is the benefit of just criticism more evident than in medical science. Pasteur, Koch and the large number of brilliant and progressive physicians at

home and abroad, and the wonderful results achieved, testify to the benefits of criticism. These men are in sympathy with the object of their critical search, a necessary condition to true and legitimate criticism.

What should be the attitude of the church towards the higher critic? We mean the Christian critic—one who believes in Christ. We answer, love, patience and gentle forbearance, even if he should be regarded by many of the brethren as heretical. It should be the last resort, in order to purge a man of error, to publicly condemn him. Our faith does not rest ultimately on the Bible, but on Christ. If men have this faith, even with erroneous views of the Bible, they have the substance of the Bible and the best eventual corrective of their error.

To demand recantation of error without convincing the mind is simply the application of outward force. An error of conduct, as it is outward, can be corrected by outward means; an error of mind must be met by conviction wrought within the mind itself.

The proper way to convince the heart of sin, and to awaken it to a consciousness of God's mercy and love, is assertion; the clear, firm, unwavering announcement of the great facts of redemption which appeal to faith. But when we come to the criticising of words, phrases, Greek and Hebrew roots, etc., we are in an entirely different sphere. Here conviction is wrought by argument; and this in the past has been the final resort of the church itself, so that we may say the triumphs of her scholarship have added their glory to the triumphs of her faith. It does not follow, if the arguments of those in error, or held by the general consciousness of the church to be in error, cannot be met, that they are to be accepted as right. It is quite evident that the higher critic may have become, for the time, preëminent in learning, while the church has been advancing in faith. That to which he has arrived by the slow process of continued and close examination must be met in the same way. The church can reject his deductions without violating his rights, or, what is of more importance to the great body of believers, her own rights;

but until his arguments are met there should be a patient reserve with regard to them.

It is unquestionable that the opposite course pursued towards Servetus wrought permanent injury to the church. An eminent physician stated to the writer that the execution of Servetus withheld from the world the knowledge of the circulation of the blood for almost a century. This he considered as great a crime against science as Calvin felt his anti-Trinitarian views were a crime against faith. It gives an altogether false and dangerous emphasis to erroneous doctrine to make as much account of it as has been done in many church trials. The notoriety gained by the accused, and the credit of superior learning ascribed to them, prove a dangerous temptation to weak and volatile minds to assume an attitude of antagonism to settled creeds.

We owe a duty to reason no less than to faith. While in religion faith is exalted above reason, yet in its own sphere reason must take the precedence of faith. The Apostle Paul unhesitatingly appeals to both these functions, not only when addressing unbelievers as Felix, Agrippa and Festus, but believers. As remarked by a friend, "The structure and style of Paul's Epistles invite criticism. He himself calls for it." "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

The testimony of Jesus to the Old Testament has been already alluded to. It is deserving of more special attention, and this we have reserved for the conclusion of this paper.

Jesus calls the Scriptures the Word of God. David is said by Him to be inspired. He calls its prophecies predictions, not mere instruction; he announces the fulfillment of some of its predictions as having been accomplished.

He recognizes Moses as the author of sacred books. So also David, Isaiah and Daniel, the very writers against whom criticism has made the most persistent assaults, and, we may add, with the most unfair and illogical reasoning.

We have collected upwards of one hundred direct references of our Saviour to the Old Testament Scriptures, personages and

events as recorded by the evangelists. Some of his statements sound as if spoken in anticipation of recent critical attack.

It is interesting and profitable to study the attitude maintained by Christ towards the Old Testament, the use He made of it, and the honor He put upon it. He declares that not one jot nor tittle of the law shall pass till all be fulfilled.

At twelve years of age He reasoned with His teachers concerning it, and declared that in such duty He was "about His Father's business." He submitted to baptism at the hands of the last Old Testament prophet, in order to "fulfill all righteousness." He met the three temptations by falling back upon the Scriptures, saying each time, "It is written," and quoting from the Word of God.

When He preached his first sermon in His native town He declared that the prophecy of Isaiah was that day fulfilled in the ears of His townsmen. When arrested and His impetuous disciple drew his sword He rebuked him with the assertion of an Old Testament truth. He then declared that He could forthwith have angelic aid if He so desired, and added, "But how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that so it must be." On the cross He cried out, in the language of the Psalms, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me? But perhaps the most touching, and at the same time most sublime, of all is the statement of the beloved disciple, "After this Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the Scriptures might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst." He Who could lay down His life of Himself waited till the final moment when all was finished in the volume of the book in which it was written of Him, "Lo! I come to do Thy will, O God!" Then, and only then, He bowed His head and gave up the Ghost.

The life of Jesus was ruled by the Word of God; without Him that Word cannot be understood; without it His life is an unsolved riddle. His person, His office, His sufferings and triumph, His church and kingdom are there predicted and set forth. His fulfilment of that Word is one ground of our hope of the perpetuation and permanency of His own words, even to the end of the world.



He who, by Christian faith and love, has entered into sympathy with the sufferings of His Lord ; who has seen, step by step, the sad fulfilment of the 53rd of Isaiah ; who has heard the dying declaration of Jesus, must feel within his heart the firm conviction, Come what will, "the Scriptures cannot be broken;" and must respond by cheerful and willing surrender to the authority of Him who declared, "Blessed are they who hear the Word of God and keep it."

## VI.

### GOD IN THE CONSTITUTION.

BY REV. A. E. TRUXAL, D. D.

#### GOD IN THE WORLD.

God is the Governor of the world. He is the Ruler of mankind. These propositions are readily accepted by the majority of men. But the question, *how* does God govern the world and rule among men is not so easily answered. Does He govern mankind from *without* or does He exercise His controlling power *in* mankind? Both propositions implied in this inquiry are no doubt in a measure true. There is an important sense in which God asserts His power upon men from without, though mediately rather than immediately. When God spoke to the people of old by the mouths of the prophets men received the word of God from without, yet that word became the power of God to govern them only to the extent that it was appropriated by the minds and hearts of the children of Israel. How God authenticated Himself and His will to the prophets, so that they could say, 'thus saith the Lord,' will, no doubt, always remain more or less a mystery. But it was God in them speaking, rather than God speaking through them. Under the new dispensation Christ spoke to men, and the Apostles spoke to men, and the Church by the Gospel continues to speak unto men. But it was God in Christ, and Christ by the Holy Ghost in the Apostles, that made their words the word of God; and it is the abiding presence of Christ by the Holy Spirit in the Church that enables her by the use of the Gospel to proclaim God's word to the world. And then here again the word of God becomes a controlling and governing power only to the extent that divine truth and principles are taken up and absorbed into the ethical life of men. These principles, however, do not exist separate and independent of the personal Being of God. They go forth from His reason and will and unceasingly hold in the same.

We claim, therefore, that God governs mankind from within rather than from without. We hold to His transcendence and to His immanence in the world. God in mankind accomplishes His great and gracious purposes ; not in the old pantheistic sense, of course, but in the theistic conception which regards Him as a separate personal being and yet dynamically present in all creation.

#### THE STATE A DIVINE INSTITUTION.

The state is a divine institution. Not, however, because God in some outward way formed the state. If He had done so He would also of necessity have given men a specific form of civil government. He did neither the first nor the second. The conditions of man were such that made it an absolute necessity for the state to come into existence. Mankind was so constituted that it could not be developed and accomplish its mission without the state.\* The state has grown out of the nature of man. It is still growing. The idea of the state has not yet been fully actualized. The state is human as well as divine. The divine idea must work itself out in the life and experience of men. It must employ the human as material for its externalization. And nothing constituted of the human under its present limitations and restrictions can reach a perfect state in the present aeon. The perfect condition can only be approximated. As Americans, we believe that the true conception of the state is more fully realized in our country than anywhere else. The people of many other nations do not agree with this opinion. The views of men are always largely influenced by the environments out of which they have come and by which they are surrounded.

#### THE CHURCH A DIVINE INSTITUTION.

The church is a divine institution in a fuller and higher sense than the state. Christ instituted the church by appointing ordi-

\* "The state has been called a divine institution, and it is a necessity to man as a moral being, and would be necessary even if man were free from all evil passions or sinful disposition, because our moral life must be an ordered life in social relations."

Rev. Carroll Cutter, D. D. *The beginning of Ethns*, page 308.

nances to be observed, commissioning men to preach the Gospel and administer the sacraments, and by sending the Holy Spirit to quicken a spiritual life in the souls of believers and be their abiding comforter. But all this was, after all, very much in the form of seed. The kingdom of heaven is like a grain of mustard seed which grows into a large tree. The divine seed finds lodgment in man's religious nature. The church had to grow and develop in accordance with the conditions of mankind. These conditions are ever changing. Hence no outward form of the church in the way of organization could be set up in the beginning for all subsequent ages. But the principles and mission of the church, as announced by Christ and proclaimed by the apostles, as well as the constitution of mankind, make church organization a necessity. Ecclesiastical organization is, therefore, of divine right. But no particular form of organization can claim such right exclusively to itself. Any form of church government demanded at a given time by the then condition of the church and the world has a divine right upon which to base its existence. The leading forms of church organization have had a sacred right for their being. The correct form of church government depends on circumstances always. The same holds good also in regard to the state. We may agree that there is a "divine right of kings," but not any more so than that there is a divine right of emperors and presidents. The state exists by divine law and order, and, as a consequence, the offices and rulers of the state, whatever they be, have the same justification for themselves. The state exists first and the rulers come as a necessity. The state is, therefore the king is. So we say of the church. She exists by divine right and appointment. She must have organization. This demands offices and rulers too. Any form of organization that is demanded by the condition of mankind comes into existence by divine sanction. We believe that the Roman hierarchy was needed in past ages. We question whether any other form of government would have accomplished as much as it did. But the Roman hierarchy abused its trust and became vitiated by corruption. It was in the course of time found wanting and its

days were numbered, though the Roman Church may yet have some mission to fulfill. According to Dr. Schaff she still has a work to do. The leading forms of church government are the Congregational, Presbyterian and Episcopal. Each has its mission, and in this country they exist side by side in time and territory. The condition of things with us seems to require these different ecclesiastical organizations.

#### THE CHURCH AND STATE NOT THE SAME.

We say, then, the state is a divine institution, and so is the church. But they are not one and the same. They are to actualize two different ideas. Each has its sphere to occupy and its own mission to fulfill. Their relation to each other and adjustment one to another depend on conditions and circumstances.

In the ancient commonwealth of Israel church and state were very closely united with each other. Under the Christian dispensation the union of church and state has also prevailed to a large extent. Such has been the prevailing order in the countries of Europe from the time of Constantine down to the present day. As to the right or wrong of this arrangement we express no opinion other than to say that it may in times past have been best for the church and for mankind that a more or less close union existed between these two institutions. But we believe that the time is near at hand when all such unions ought to come to an end. The civilized nations of the earth have arrived at such a condition that, in our opinion, the church ought to be disconnected and separated from the state; when the church ought not to meddle with the affairs of the state and when the national government ought not to interfere with the ecclesiastical and spiritual affairs of the church; when each institution ought to confine its operations and activities to the sphere of its own peculiar mission.

#### IF UNITED, WHICH IS SUPREME?

When church and state are united the question arises as to which factor ought predominate in the union. Shall the church be subject to the state or the state to the church? Both con



ceptions have been put into practical operation. Church supremacy over all the world has been the cherished but vain dream of the Roman hierarchy; prior to the Reformation this idea was to a large extent actualized. Nearly all Europe was then under the control of the church, at the head of which stood the Pope. He was the king of kings, and the ruler of rulers. But that order has completely broken down. The Pope to-day is shorn of his temporal power. The ideal of Church supremacy "now stands in history as a ghastly specter from the past."

When the Reformation set in and as it progressed the order was reversed. The state became supreme; the civil government exercised its authority in ecclesiastical and religious matters. This is largely the state of things yet in the countries of the old world. Church supremacy leads to hierarchism; state supremacy leads to Cæsarism or Erastianism. The one produces priestcraft, the other kingcraft. The final results of both are evil.

#### SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE.

In the United States we find a new principle in operation. Here a complete separation of church and state is demanded. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The condition of things in the colonies necessitated the adoption of this principle. This idea was not brought here from abroad. It was an American growth. The Puritans, though they had fled from oppression and religious persecution, set up an order of things in which church and state were united. The civil power exercised its authority in religious matters. In the colony of Massachusetts the Congregationalists were predominant; in Rhode Island the Baptists; in Maryland the Catholics; in Virginia the Episcopal; in Pennsylvania the Quakers; and scattered throughout all the colonies were members of the Reformed, Lutheran and other churches. Consequently when the colonies came to organize themselves into a national government they found it necessary to leave religion and the church entirely out of consideration. The operations of the state formed by them had to be limited to po-

litical and secular affairs. The idea adopted by the fathers was that the church should represent the religion of the nation, and the government should have charge exclusively of the secular interests of the people. And this idea has become so thoroughly rooted and grounded in the convictions of the citizens that an interference of the one institution with the other would not for a single moment be tolerated. The view clearly and tenaciously held is that each shall confine itself to its own sphere and accomplish its own mission in human society.

#### PROVINCE OF THE CHURCH.

It is the province of the church to represent the religion of the state; to profess faith in Almighty God, the Creator and Father of all men and the everlasting Ruler of the world, and in Jesus Christ the Saviour of men, and in the Holy Ghost, the comforter and sanctifier of them that believe; to maintain and defend the faith though not with carnal weapons; to preach the gospel to the people; to call upon all men, high and low, rich and poor, rulers and ruled, to repent of their sins, believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and fear to offend against the Lord God, warning the nation and individual citizens against the terrible results that will inevitably follow from a defiance of the Lord, unbelief, wickedness and sin; to gather into her fold men, women and children and to influence them to a life of righteousness and holiness before God and man. In the church and through the church the state is to give expression to its faith, hope and trust in the Lord God.

#### PROVINCE OF THE STATE.

The state through its government has nothing whatever to do with the religion of the people. Its province is to guarantee unto the citizens the enjoyment of their inalienable rights; to maintain justice, equity and righteousness among the people, and to carry on such domestic and foreign affairs as will be for the benefit, welfare and safety of all the people.

The National Constitution is to set forth the rights of the people to be maintained, the fundamental laws by which they are to

be governed, and to describe the form of government to be operated amongst them and over them. It is not its province to profess faith in God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. That duty belongs to the church. Our government has to deal exclusively with secular matters; it has no voice in the spiritual and eternal interests of the people. Civil contracts between individuals, municipal corporations and national government all belong to the same category. They are all concerned with temporalities. They belong to the worldly sphere of our life. There is no call for the insertion of the name of God in a civil contract, or in the charter of a city, or in the National Constitution, and nothing would be accomplished thereby. If the parties to the contract are religious, God-fearing men they will be faithful to the conditions at any rate, and if they are irreligious and godless the name of God in the agreement will not constrain them in the least. In fact, such a use of the name of God would be a profanation of it. The same must be said in a general way in regard to the insertion of God's name in the National Constitution. It is not necessary as a confession of the religious faith of the nation, as that confession is made by the church. It would add nothing to the faithfulness and integrity of the conscientious ruler or lawmaker, and it would carry no force with it for the unbelieving and immoral officer, though he be required to subscribe to the constitution and make oath to obey and defend the same. By committing the nation to faith in God through a preamble to the Constitution and requiring the thousands of officials in the national government, from the highest to the lowest, to subscribe to the same, regardless of their moral and religious character, would be forcing a religious faith upon the believer, the infidel and immoral man alike. Instead of honoring God by such an act, it would be conniving at blasphemy by putting the Lord's name in the mouth of the wicked. Moreover, the enforcement by the state of a confession of faith in God upon any one against the free choice of his own heart and will is altogether repugnant to the spirit of our people and the fundamental principle of our government. It may be said that no one is compelled to be a

citizen of our country or to hold office under its government. If any one cannot accept the declaration of faith in God he can simply stand aside. But that would be virtually setting up a religious test, something which the people of the United States would not tolerate for a single moment. A forced religion is a Mohammedan idea, a Russian idea, a Romish idea, a state-church idea, but it is not the idea of the United States of America, and we do not believe it to be a Gospel idea.

### THE CHRISTIAN STATE.

Embodying the name of God in our Constitution would not make us a Christian nation any more than we already are. What constitutes a Christian nation? When the religion of the people is Christian the nation is Christian. When the people in general maintain the Christian faith, worship and morality; when the rulers and lawmakers are governed by the principles of the Christian religion and morality; when the institutions of the country are of a Christian character; when the laws of the land, fundamental and statutory, are inspired by and embody the righteousness, equity and love of the gospel of Jesus Christ, then it can with propriety and truth be said that the nation is Christian.\* But no constitutional declaration of the nation's faith and trust in the Lord would bring about such results. The name of God printed in the fundamental law would not possess any such magical power as to produce the much desired condition.

\* Dr. H. Martensen in his Christian ethics assumes that no state can exist without moral ideas and that these rest on religious ideas; and on page 101, second division, he says: "We define the Christian state as that whose fundamental moral ideas are determined by Christianity, as that which finds its most determined, and therefore its supra-political, impulses and ideas in the Christian view of life and the world." With this we heartily agree. And judging the United States by this standard, we must say that they constitute a Christian state. For the ideas of right, justice, equality of all men before the law and before God, liberty, obedience to law, the family, purity and others of like character which underlie the state are unquestionably derived from Christianity. But we cannot agree with the views of this author in regard to the correct form of the state and its relation to the church.

Christianity must Christianize the nation. The responsibility and power lie with the church and Christian people. The church by the power of the Gospel placed in her hands and by the power of Christianity embodied and exemplified in the lives and works of her members must convert the citizens unto the Lord and bring them under the moulding, guiding and governing power of divine truth. If the church fails to quicken the conscience of the rulers, lawmakers and people then everything will fail. The Gospel preached and lived alone possesses the power to bring men, whether as officials or as citizens, to a consciousness of their obligations to Almighty God, and influence them to recognize the same. Christian faith and morality cannot be legislated into people, neither by the Constitution nor by laws enacted. All such efforts will prove worse than futile in the end.

#### THE MINISTER'S WARRANT.

But if the Constitution does not recognize God as the Supreme Ruler of nations and men, how can ministers of the Gospel call upon the government to obey and enforce the laws of God? How can they ask the legislators and the executive and the judicial officers to enforce the integrity and righteousness taught in the word of God? The answer is, the minister of the Gospel does not and would in no case receive the warrant for his message from the constitution and laws of the state. His authority to speak comes from no human deliverance and enactment. He receives his warrant from the church, from the Gospel, from the Lord Jesus Christ. By this warrant he has authority to speak to the people, the nation and to the world. He has the right in the name of the Lord to demand of rulers that they acknowledge, fear and obey the Lord God; that such laws shall be enacted and enforced as will encourage, maintain and defend Christian morality. The church has the right, and it is her duty in virtue of what she is and represents, to speak to the state in regard to all matters affecting the law of God. Just here, however, especially in our country, comes to view the weakness of the church, not because of anything lacking in the form of the state, but



because of her own divided condition. As at present constituted, the church cannot speak to the state with one mind and mouth. The multiplication of sects is the bane of American Christianity. It might have been in a practical way good for the church and state, and redounded to the welfare of society, if the national government had years ago already forbidden the formation of additional denominations of religion. But such interference would be a violation of the principle adopted in this country. The sect system is the false exercise of the doctrine of religious freedom. But we had better endure this evil than run the risk of the greater evils that would in all probability follow upon the interference of the state with the religious affairs of the people.

Our conclusion, then, is that the insertion of the name of God in the Constitution would not be in harmony with, but in contradiction of, the principle of entire separation of church and state as adopted and held by the people of the United States; further, that such fact would carry with itself no sanctifying power, nor add anything to the authority of the church to proclaim and insist upon the morality and righteousness of the Gospel, nor would it redound in any special way to the glory of God or the enhancement of His Kingdom.

#### DIFFERENT VIEWS OF THE STATE.

We are aware that many writers on ethics have regarded the state in a different light from that in which we have viewed it in this paper. But such writers generally have in mind a different form of civil government and a different relation of church to state from those obtaining with us. We must view the question from the standpoint of a republican form of government and an entire separation of church and state. If this is a proper and good form of government for us, and a legitimate and correct adjustment of the two institutions to one another, then they must also be justified in the sphere of ethics. The writers of the old world, as far as we have been able to ascertain, hold to the opinion that the correct conception of the state necessitates some form of

monarchical government, inclining to a preference for a hereditary rather than an elective monarchy. The Pope of Rome is willing to express an admiration for our government, but does not hesitate to say that he still does not regard it as an ideal form. We believe that in the Providence of God we have been led to adopt a better form of government than any nation has ever had and to adjust church and state more satisfactorily than was ever done before. This relation has been defined as a "reciprocal independence." The separation is not an absolute one. State and church owe duties to each other, positive as well as negative. These we will not attempt to outline here. The order established in our country is yet an experiment. But the experiment has stood the test of a hundred years, and the indications now are that the order will be a permanent one. And this order prevents the state from having anything officially to do with faith and religion.

#### ORDAINED OF GOD.

The view we have presented does not deny that "the powers that be are ordained of God." The rulers of our government, though limited in their activity and operations to secular matters, are surely as much the instruments of God as was the Emperor of heathen Rome in the days of St. Paul. They are ordained, not, however, in any sense to take the place of the church, but to maintain peace, preserve order, encourage those that do well and to punish evil doers. There is an important sense in which they hold office and wield power "by the grace of God."

The ideas of right, virtue, love, mercy and charity have their origin in God, have been revealed by the Lord Jesus Christ, and are proclaimed by the church. These ideas the Christian state is to maintain and enforce in the operation of its government. The electors of the country ought to realize that the ultimate source of power is in the Lord God and cast their votes for men who realize their obligation to God, and the church ought to bring the electors to a sense of their duty in this regard. And those in official stations in the nation ought not forget Him whence all power proceeds. And it would unquestionably be a

great gain to the religion and morals of the country if the men at the head of the government and those in the legislative halls were religious and God-fearing men who faithfully worshipped the Lord in His sanctuary and discharged their official duties with a conscience void of offense towards God and men always."

The state must depend on the church to produce men of such character and to quicken the conscience of the voters that they will call these men then to places of authority in the state. For, as Dr. N. C. Schaeffer clearly set forth on January 26th in a sermon at Lancaster, Pa., the most important thing in all government is that the righteous should be in authority. The history of the world furnishes numerous examples under different forms of government and under different constitutional formulas establishing the truth of the proverb, "when the righteous are authority the people rejoice, but when the wicked beareth rule the people mourn."

## VII.

### PREACHING CHRIST—THE THEME AND THE TIMES.

BY REV. M. L. YOUNG, PH. D.

The Apostle Paul, in contrasting his ministry with that of Judaizing teachers, declares the theme of his preaching to be the glory of the exalted Christ. Not himself, his learning, his reputation, his profound insight acquired by marvellously acute penetration into the philosophy of his own age and ages preceding; no graces of person, no powers of mind, no force of character, possessed by himself, does he preach. The gospel he proclaimed is not his, but Christ's. He would have no one say, "I am of Paul." The only name he preached was the "name which is above every name," the name Jesus, before whom every knee shall bow and whom every tongue shall confess as Lord. What a remarkable absence of desire for self-assertion in all Paul's preaching! The content and aim of the message he delivered were: "Christ Jesus the Lord."

A question, timely in every period of the church's history, comes to the ministry of to-day—the question, "What shall we preach?" The ready answer to this question is "the gospel of which Christ is the content." Paul says, "We preach Christ Jesus." He is to be preached as the exalted One, the bearer of the Divine glory or, as one has well said, "as the Head of the church, as the Possessor and Bestower of the whole Divine fulness of grace, as the Judge of the world, as the Conqueror of all hostile powers, as the Intercessor for His own, in short, as the Wearer of the whole majesty which belongs to His Kingly office."

But it is asked: "Did not Paul preach a crucified Christ?" "Did he not glory in the cross of Christ?" He did, but the preaching of the crucifixion and the resurrection is the preaching of one gospel—a gospel of sweetest harmony. The glory of the exalted Christ is a consequence of the death of the cross. It is the Christ that died who has risen and "is at the right hand of

God, who also maketh intercession for us." The completion of his redemptive work was conditioned by His sufferings and death, and the whole gospel is contained in the words He spoke to the two perturbed disciples on their way to Emmaus: "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into His glory?"

The apostles preached Christ—Christ crucified, Christ risen; and modern preachers must proclaim the same gospel. The preacher who substitutes anything else for Christ is not worthy of his high calling. The preacher dares not accommodate himself to the doctrine demanded by worldly wisdom, scientific theories or theological speculation. He must not keep back any of the distinctive features of the gospel, nor allow any tampering with the conditions it imposes. To the Jews the gospel preached by the apostles was an offence, and to the Greeks it was foolishness. These two classes repudiated it because it did not conform to their preconceived notions as to what salvation should be. The Jews looked for a deliverer who would rule over them as a temporal king and put under foot the enemies of their nation. When Christ came, declaring that His kingdom was not of this world, the Jews said He is not the Messiah, and they rejected Him. The Greeks desired a religion which would conform to the teachings of their philosophy and of human reason, and, from their point of view, the way of salvation proclaimed by the apostles was marked by many absurdities, and thus to the Greek the gospel became a subject of ridicule. But the first evangelists did not seek to fashion the gospel by the mold of Jewish prejudice or Grecian pride. They preached it as it had been received whether men would hear or forbear.

Christ must ever be proclaimed as the true panacea. He can cure the morally diseased. In Him is found the only remedy for sin and death, and with implicit confidence we may point to Him as "the way, the truth and the life," as the One in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, as possessing all that the world needs for its well-being. To preach Him, therefore, is the great mission of the preacher for all time.

Notwithstanding the clear call of the preacher to bear to men



a message universal and perpetual, we must not disregard the duty of preaching Christ in His special adaptation to human needs. Timeliness is an important element in true preaching.

Although in every community and age sin is essentially the same as to its nature and consequences, yet it changes in form, and the Christ, eternally the same, must be held forth in such manner as to meet the different phases which sin assumes under changed moral conditions. The sins of the Pharisee were not the same in form as those of the publican, and the truth as it is in Christ was not applied to these two classes alike; nor do we in our day bring the truth to bear in the same form against all prevailing sins. Christ is the light of the world—the light to dispel all darkness, but as from the facets of a diamond the light flashes in different directions, so gospel truth is many-sided, sending out its light everywhere, and upon every form of moral darkness.

There must be special adaptation of the truth in seeking the cure of such unlike and multiform sins as *mammonism*, which closes the heart to the cry of the needy and builds fortunes upon the unrequited toil of the poor; *political corruption*, with the attendant evils of oppression, injustice and fraud; *intemperance* with its untold miseries, both physical and moral; and *selfishness*, the leader of the long train of individual, social and national sins. For these and all other evils there is a remedy, but it must be specifically applied. The right adaptation of the truth to sin under varying circumstances is the important and difficult study of the preacher.

The social and moral condition of man changes, and the true preacher of every age asks seriously, prayerfully and anxiously, "What is the message my Lord would have me bear to the people of my day?" Very forcibly has the scholarly editor of this REVIEW said: "What has Christ now to say to the questions, doctrinal and practical, which agitate this age? That is, what the ministry adapted to the times, is bound to discover and proclaim. What, for example, has Christ to say to the liquor question? The answer to this is not to be obtained directly from

what He said and did nineteen centuries ago. The fact that Christ produced wine by a miracle at the wedding of Cana is no proof that He would now sanction the sale and use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage. . . . Again, what has Christ to say on the labor question? What has he to say to the millionaire, and what to the man without capital? What has he to say to the man in the mill, and what to the man in the office? To all these parties Christ has something to say, and it is the business of the ministry to say it for Him."

Our preaching must be adapted to the wants of the congregations we serve and the community in which we live. The word must be rightly divided with a view to prevailing sins, errors and needs. The doctrine, the reproof, the correction, the instruction in righteousness, suited to one congregation may not be suited, in the same form, to another.

A timely preaching of Christ lays right stress on the interests of the present life. The kingdom of God is to be established here and now. "The kingdom of God is within you," is the declaration of Christ, and the King himself teaches us that He sets up his throne in the hearts of men. His authority is to be recognized in individual, social and national life. The principles of his kingdom are designed to permeate and sanctify every estate of mankind. Christ is in the world as its rightful Ruler and He has not surrendered his government to the evil one. The present life is not given over to the control of Satan. A book was published several years ago bearing the title, "Preaching to the Preachers." Its author is a layman, an eminent professor in one of our great universities, and the earnest words of this intelligent, observant and consecrated layman deserve serious consideration on the part of the clergy. He says, "Preachers set before their listeners the delights, the hope, the reward of a future life, but Christianity is primarily concerned with this life. It is to redeem the present world and establish here a kingdom of righteousness. . . . The world has transferred the domain of dogma and the future life to the church and has kept for itself the present life." He continues, "Notice how quickly Christ turns his disci-

ples away from speculations about the future to present duties, when they approach him with inquiries about the hereafter." There is more than a grain of truth in this writer's declaration, "Because we have concerned ourselves too much with the hereafter, we have neglected an examination of present duties."

The preaching of the apostles was effective not only because they had the mind of Christ, but also because they thoroughly understood the age in which they lived. They had full knowledge of the vices and virtues of the people of that time. They were acquainted with habits of life and modes of thought. They understood the wants of men of that day and were diligent in the work of setting forth Christ in such manner as to meet these wants. To-day, as nineteen centuries ago, the preacher needs the mind of Christ, and this he gets by the Spirit's aid in the diligent study of the written word, and earnest, importunate prayer, but he needs also to know the minds of his fellowmen, and in order to obtain such knowledge he must study social and economic questions. He is the better fitted for the work of his high calling by the investigation of political, sociological and ethical problems of modern life.

Who is sufficient for the difficult and responsible service of bringing the mind and power of Christ to bear upon the multi-form disorders and needs of the age in which we live? The business of the preacher is to do more than tell what Christ said and did when He was on earth. If this were all the preacher had to do his work would be easy, but preaching Christ now implies the hearing and interpretation of the words and works of Christ in our day.

It is a part of our work to search for the principles which lie beneath the rules and precepts contained in the Scriptures and apply them to the needs of souls in this generation. "We must," as Dr. Wm. M. Taylor says, "learn what kind of a book the New Testament is; for it is not a list of distinct precepts, each of which is applicable to only one case, but it is a book of living principles of universal application. . . . . To read it as if it were a set of rubies, with minute directions for every detail of

conduct, will make us Pharisees; to read it as a book of great principles, that are to have free course through all our actions, will make us disciples of Him who went about doing good."

Besides searching for the principles of the Gospel with such persistent diligence that we may tell men with confidence what Christ would have them do amidst present-day surroundings, we are to present Him as the source of strength for the performance of that which they know to be their duty. Man to-day needs personal power to do the right and resist evil; power to serve, to suffer and to die; power such as Paul possessed when he said, "I can do all things." Such power man does not have in himself. Christ is the source of it. He imparts it to men. Paul could do all things because he had come into contact with Christ. Hear him, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me."

We read, in the Gospel, of publicans and sinners—the dishonest and vile. Doubtless they heard many admonitions to lead honest and pure lives, but not until their souls were brought into touch with the living Christ did they have the peace and power of a renewed nature. The diseased woman touched, with trembling hand, the hem of Christ's garment and she was healed immediately. She heard the Master's gracious words, "Daughter, be of good comfort; thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace." Such power she never felt before, though she had spent all her living upon physicians. Zaccheus may have heard frequently of the great sin of dishonesty, but not until he sought to see Jesus and obeyed the call to come down from the tree to Him was his soul touched with moral power. When brought into personal contact with Christ he could say, "The half of my goods I give to the poor, and if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation I restore him fourfold."

The preacher must bring men to Christ. He is the great Physician. He can heal all diseases. "He healeth the broken in heart and bindeth up their wounds." But the only hope of cure is in being brought to the Physician. That was a strange scene in Capernaum. In a house of that city our Saviour is preaching

the word. The people fill the house so that there is no room even about the door. A helpless paralytic is without, borne by four men, but they cannot get near Jesus because of the crowd. Are they discouraged? See them ascending the outside stairs, digging through the roof and letting down, in the presence of Jesus, the bed whereon the sick of the palsy lay. Everything standing between the soul and Christ must be broken through. Our work is to bring souls to Christ. There are many difficulties in the way of being saved and of saving others, but when Jesus sees our faith He will say to the sin-sick soul we bring to Him, "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee."

Behold, another scene! Jesus has been preaching on the shores of the Galilean sea. Weary and worn, He goes to the desert to rest, but the crowd, thousands upon thousands, follow Him. The disciples said, "Send them away." Christ said, "Feed them." Andrew said, "There is a lad here who has five barley loaves and two small fishes, but what are they among so many?" And Jesus commanded the disciples to make all sit down, and, lifting His eyes to heaven, He blessed the food and gave to His disciples to set before the multitude. When all were filled He commanded the disciples to take up the fragments. Christ has food for the spiritually hungry, enough for all, but we are to help dispense this food to the world. He uses us if we stand ready to obey Him.

The preacher sits at the feet of the Divine Teacher to learn His will, and then goes forth to declare it to others. It is not enough to talk about our Lord; we must obey him.

Readiness to do the will of Him whose commission the preacher holds is an essential preparation for preaching Christ in our times. We do well to ponder these earnest words of a great preacher: "I tell you, my brethren, we need, first of all things, ourselves to admit Christ into our own minds and our hearts and our lives as absolute Lord. We can then oppose and overawe the confidence of philosophy and of science with a mightier confidence than theirs. And we need to go forth with the sense of heraldship in our hearts, and summon men, in the name of our King and theirs,



to instant and unconditional submission. This will give to our preaching a definite and an inspiring name. We shall constantly be animated with a conscious purpose. Whenever we stand before our fellow men we shall know why we are there. We shall be there to bring them into obedience, or into better obedience to Christ. . . . If there be yet anywhere a falling away from Christ, it will not, I am sure, be among those preachers who accept it for the one aim of their preaching to get Christ obeyed. One anchor can hold us, whatever winds or tides or tempests beat. Simple, humble, steadfast, childlike obedience to Christ—that is a bond which never yet was broken. It is our safety and the safety of the world."

---

## VIII.

### NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

**NINE LECTURES ON PREACHING.** Delivered at Yale College, New Haven, Conn., by Rev. R. W. Dale, D. D., Birmingham, England. Publishers: A. S. Barnes & Co., New York, Chicago and New Orleans. Pages 302. Price \$1.25.

These lectures were delivered in 1877, on the foundation of the Lyman Beecher Lectureship of the Divinity School of Yale College. Though nineteen years have elapsed since their first publication, they have lost nothing of their original interest and of their applicability to the condition and wants of the modern preacher. The style in which they are composed is clear and vigorous, and the reader does not grow sleepy or tired in the perusal of them.

The subjects discussed in these lectures are the following: "Perils of Young Preachers," "The Intellect in Relation to Preaching," "Reading," "The Preparation of Sermons," "Extemporaneous Preaching and Style," "Evangelistic Preaching," "Pastoral Preaching," "The Conduct of Public Worship." These various topics are treated with much ability and force by the distinguished lecturer, who was himself an able and successful preacher, and who has now gone to his reward in the church triumphant. In his ecclesiastical relations and in theology the lecturer was a Congregationalist of the orthodox,

though liberal and progressive, type. As far as his theology comes to view in these lectures we may not always agree with him; but that is no reason why we should not be able to learn many things from him on the subject of preaching.

We welcome books of this kind because we believe that ministers can not be too well informed in regard to the nature and duties of their office as preachers. We agree with what Dr. Dale himself says on page 93 of this volume. "Some men," he says, "speak contemptuously of lectures on preaching and treatises on the science or art of rhetoric. For myself, I have read scores of books of this kind, and I have never read one without finding in it some useful suggestion. I advise you to read every book on preaching that you can buy or borrow, whether it is old or new, Catholic or Protestant, English, French or German. Learn on what principles the great preachers of other churches as well as of your own, of other countries as well as of your own, of ancient as well as of modern times, have done their work."

Preaching is not an easy art; and yet its results depend largely upon the manner in which it is exercised. We do not forget that the effect is conditioned also by the influence of the Holy Spirit, and by the faith or unbelief of those who hear. But we believe that the influence of the Holy Spirit will also be present when there is true and earnest preaching of the Gospel; and that in such circumstances the faith and interest of those who hear may always be counted on. In this connection we quote what Dr. Dale says, page 34, on *interest* in preaching. "I doubt," he says, "whether preachers have any right to complain if people who used to come to church regularly get into the habit of staying away. If we were *interesting* they would find it pleasanter to listen to our sermons than to spend the morning at home, writing letters or reading the newspapers. I am sure that we have no right to complain if, while we are preaching, people go to sleep. It is our duty to keep them awake. Nor have we any right to complain that while they seem to be listening to us, they are thinking of their farm or their store, or the new flower they have got for their greenhouse, or the new horse they have bought for their carriage."

We are sure that the perusal of these lectures by young preachers will be found helpful in the discharge of the most difficult functions of their office.

W. R.

**THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY.** By the Rev. Andrew Harper, B. D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Ormond College within the University, Melbourne, New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1895. Price \$1.50.

This volume, which belongs to the series entitled the "Expositor's Bible," is a work of superior merit. The many interest-

ing topics pertaining to Deuteronomy are discussed with marked learning and ability, and in such a way as to make them both very interesting and very instructive. As regards the authorship of this book of Scripture, Dr. Harper believes it to have been written, not by Moses, but by some one who lived centuries after Moses. "Probably," he says, "we may date it between Hezekiah and Josiah." He does not, however, on this account, deny to it the character of true history. "The result of all the indications," he says, "is that the story of Moses, as the author of Deuteronomy knew it, rests upon authentic information handed down somehow, probably in written documents, from the earliest time. Apart from the question of inspiration, therefore, we may rest upon it as reliable in all essentials. Only in him and the revelation he received have we an adequate cause for the great upheaval of religious feeling which shaped and characterized all in the after-history of Israel." Other subjects specially treated in the volume are The Divine Government, The Form and Substance of the Decalogue, The Mediatorship of Moses, Love to God the Law of Life, Mosaic View of Education, The Ban in Deuteronomy VII. and in Modern Life, Israel's Election and Motives for Faithfulness, Law and Religion, Laws of Sacrifice, The Relation of Old Testament Sacrifice to Christianity, The Economic Aspects of Israelite Life, Justice in Israel, Laws of Purity, and Laws of Kindness. The discussion of all these subjects is throughout reverential and scholarly. It is also unusually suggestive. As a whole the volume is a truly valuable one, and equal in merit to any in the series to which it belongs.

THE SHORTER BIBLE CHRONOLOGICALLY ARRANGED : Being the Holy Bible Abridged and with its Writings Synchronized for Popular Reading. Lucy Rider Meyer, Editor, Author of "Deacones," "Fair Land of Chemistry," "The Jewish Offerings," "Children's Meetings," etc. With an Introduction by Bishop John H. Vincent. New York : Hunt & Eaton, Cincinnati : Cranston & Curtis, Price \$2.50.

The character of this work is very well set forth in the contents of the title page. It is an attempt to reduce Bible history to a single narrative, arranged as far as possible in chronological order, and so as to bring the various Scriptures into their proper relation the one to the other. The work is based on other harmonistic attempts, and the text followed is that of the Revised Version. The object of the work is "not to divert from, but to attract toward, the whole Bible." This it seeks to do by breaking through the "crust of staleness that has gathered over the Bible from countless repetitions" and "by presenting the book to the eye as books of to-day are presented, and divesting it of repetitions and of those parts which, by reason of the great change of circumstances and the vast lapse of time since its

composition, need the assistance of a commentary to be understood." There is an abridgment of nearly two-thirds. The condensation generally is of a judicious character. The work, if properly used, can scarcely fail to be serviceable.

**PROGRESS IN SPIRITUAL KNOWLEDGE.** By the Rev. Chauncey Giles, Author of "The Nature of Spirit," "The Incarnation and Atonement," "Heavenly Blessedness," etc. A Memorial Volume. Philadelphia, American New Church Tract and Publication Society, 2129 Chestnut Street, 1895. Price \$1.50.

This volume consists of a biographical sketch of Rev. Giles together with twenty-one of his sermons. It is published, as indicated on the title page, as a memorial volume. The title of the book is furnished by the subject of the first sermon contained in it. Rev. Giles was a prominent minister of the New Jerusalem Church and a man of most excellent spirit. The biographical sketch of him is reprinted with slight change from the *New Church Review*, of January, 1894, and is full and interesting. The sermons are all admirable in style and method. They present, in a very clear and striking manner, the principal doctrines of the church to which the author belonged. Those who desire to acquaint themselves with these doctrines will find this volume admirably suited to their purpose. On their own account, however, the sermons, will repay perusal because of their excellence. It would be well if all sermons were as clear and forcible in the presentation of truth.